



भारत का राजपत्र

The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 48]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, दिसम्बर 1, 1979/अग्रहायण 10, 1901

No. 48) NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1979/AGRAHAYANA 10, 1901

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह भलग संकलन के क्षय में रखा जा सके।

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(राज मंत्रालय को छोड़ कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राष्ट्रसभेत् प्रशासनों को छोड़ कर)
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गए साधितिक घारेश और अधिसूचनाएं

**Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities (other than the
Administrations of Union Territories)**

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 18th November, 1979

S.O. 3851.—In the Commission's Notification No. 282/GJ/SC-ST/79 dated 31st October, 1979 published under S.O. 617 (E) at pages 1099 and 1100 in Hindi and English in Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated 31st October, 1979, the necessary amendments shall be made as under :—

- the Date of the said notification both in Hindi and English shall be read as "18th October, 1979" instead of "31st October, 1979";
- In the Hindi version of the said notification under item 2(1)(1), the serial number of the constituency shall be read as "9—"; and
- In the English version of the said notification under item II (1) for the words "Parliament Constituencies" read "Parliamentary Constituencies".

[No. 282/GJ/SC-ST/70/3139]
V. K. RAO, Under Secy.

गृह मंत्रालय

(कार्यिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 13 नवम्बर, 1979

सं. श० 3852—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के प्रनुच्छेद 309 के परत्तुक और प्रनुच्छेद 148 के खण्ड (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारतीय लेखा परीक्षा और लेखा विभाग में सेवा करते हुए व्यक्तियों के संबंध में नियंत्रक और महालेखापरीक्षक से परामर्श करते के पाचात् प्रभिवादी भविष्य निधि नियम (भारत), 1960 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित, नियम बनाते हैं, इस्तें :—

- (1) इन नियमों का नाम प्रभिवादी भविष्य निधि (भारत) धौथा संशोधन नियम, 1979 है।
 - (2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रयुक्त होंगे।
 - उक्त नियमों के नियम 13 के उपनियम'(1) में, खण्ड (ष) और (८) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित खण्ड रखे जाएंगे, प्रथात् :—
- "(ष) प्रभिवादी, उसके कुटुम्ब के किसी सदस्य या उस पर वस्तुतः आश्रित किसी व्यक्ति द्वारा या उसके विशद् नाई गई विद्यिक कार्यविहारों का खण्ड बहन करने के लिए, इस मामले में उपलब्ध अधिकार, किसी अन्य सरकारी लोग से इसी प्रयोजन के लिए अनुबोध किसी अधिक के प्रतिरक्षण होगा।

(३) अभिदाता की प्रतिरक्षा का खर्च यहन करने के लिए, जहाँ वह अपने विरुद्ध किसी अधिकारित शासकीय प्रबन्धार की बाबत जांच में अपनी प्रतिरक्षा के लिए किसी विधि अवशायी को नियुक्त करता है।"

[सं. एफ. ९(२)-८०-५ (सी)पि/७८-सी०पी०एफ०]

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

(Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 13th November, 1979.

S.O. 3852.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution, the President after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Contributory Provident Fund Rules (India), 1962, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Contributory Provident Fund (India) Fourth Amendment Rules, 1979.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In sub-rule (1) of rule 13 of the said rules, for clauses (d) and (e), the following clauses shall be substituted, namely :—

"(d) to meet the cost of legal proceedings instituted by or against the subscriber, any member of his family or any person actually dependent upon him, the advance in this case being available in addition to any advance admissible for the same purpose from any other Government source.

(e) to meet the cost of the subscriber's defence where he engages a legal practitioner to defend himself in an enquiry in respect of any alleged official misconduct on his part".

[No. F. 9(2)-EV(B)/Pen/78-CPF]

का० आ० ३८५३—राज्यपति, संघीयान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परस्तक और अनुच्छेद 148 के अंडे (५) द्वारा प्रबल शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारतीय नेतृत्व, परीक्षा और लेत्रा विभाग में सेवा कर रहे व्यक्तियों के संबंध में, नियंत्रक और महानेत्रापरीक्षक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् साधारण भविष्य निधि (केन्द्रीय सेवा) नियम, 1960 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम साधारण भविष्य निधि (केन्द्रीय सेवा) अध्या संशोधन नियम, 1979 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होगी।

2. उक्त नियमों के नियम 12 के उपनियम (1) में, अंडे (८) और (३) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित लांड रखे जाएंगे, अर्थात् :—

"(८) अभिदाता, उसके फूटुद्वय के किसी सदस्य या उस पर वस्तु: शाश्वत किसी व्यक्ति द्वारा या उसके विरुद्ध लाई गई विधिक कार्यवाहियों का खर्च यहन करने के लिए, इस मामले में उपलब्ध अधिकारी को भ्रष्ट से इसी प्रयोग के लिए अनुबोध किसी अधिकारी के प्रतिरक्षा होगा।"

(९) अभिदाता की प्रतिरक्षा का खर्च यहन करने के लिए, जहाँ वह अपने विरुद्ध किसी अधिकारित शाश्वत प्रबन्धार की बाबत जांच में अपनी प्रतिरक्षा के लिए किसी विधि अवशायी को नियुक्त करता है।"

[सं. एफ. ९(२)-८०-५(सी)पि/७८-सी०पी०एफ०]

एस० आर० अग्रवाल, अवार सचिव

S.O. 3853—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution the President after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, hereby makes the following

rules further to amend the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Rules, 1960, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Sixth Amendment Rules, 1979.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In sub-rule (1) of rule 12 of the said rules, for clauses (d) and (e), the following clauses shall be substituted, namely :—

"(d) to meet the cost of legal proceedings instituted by or against the subscriber, any member of his family or any person actually dependent upon him, the advance in this case being available in addition to any advance admissible for the same purpose from any other Government source.

(e) to meet the cost of the subscriber's defence where he engages a legal practitioner to defend himself in an enquiry in respect of any alleged official misconduct on his part".

[No. F. 9(2)-EV(B)/Pen/78-GPF]

S. R. AGGRAWAL, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

प्राप्ति

नई विस्ती, 30 नवम्बर, 1979

स्टाम्प

का० आ० ३८५४—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के अंडे (क) द्वारा प्रबल शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा उस शुल्क को माफ करती है, जो रुरल इलेक्ट्रिफ़िकेशन कार्पोरेशन की लिमिटेड, नई विस्ती द्वारा प्रोमिशरी नोटों के रूप में जारी किये जाने वाले बीस करोड़ सात लाख और पवास हजार रुपये मूल्य के बन्धपत्रों और परवर्ती अन्वरणों के मालीभूत दस्तावेजों पर, उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत प्राप्त हैं।

[सं. 35/79-स्टाम्प-का० मं. 33/46/79-वि० क०]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

ORDER

Nw Delhi, the 30th October, 1979

STAMPS

S.O. 3854.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of Section 9 of the Indian Stamps Act, 1899 (2 of 1899) the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the bonds in the form of promissory notes to the value of twenty crores, seven lakhs and fifty thousand of rupees, to be issued by the Rural Electrification Corporation Limited, New Delhi and the documents evidencing subsequent transfers of the same are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 35/79-Stamps-F. No. 33/46/79-ST]

नई विस्ती, 15 नवम्बर, 1979

का० आ० ३८५५—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 20 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के वित्त मंत्रालय (राजस्व विभाग) की 8 अगस्त, 1979 की अधिसूचना सं. 24/79 स्टाम्प का० सं. 33/1/79-वि० कर सं. का० आ० 2843 की अधिकालन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, स्टाम्प शुल्क की संगणना के प्रयोजन से, नीचे की सारणी के सम्बन्ध (2) में विनियिष्ट विदेशी मुद्रा का भारतीय मुद्रा में मंपरिवर्तन के लिये, विनियम की दर उसके सम्बन्ध (3) में तत्सम्बन्धी प्रविष्टि में विहित करती है।

सारणी		
क्रम संख्या	विवेशी मुद्रा	100 रु के समतुल्य विवेशी मुद्रा के विनिमय की दर
1	2	3
1.	आस्ट्रियन शिलिंग	153
2.	आस्ट्रेलियन डॉलर	10.63
3.	बेल्जियन फ्रैंक	342
4.	कनाडियन डॉलर	14.26
5.	डेनिश क्रोनर	62.00
6.	डच मार्क	21.30
7.	डच गिल्डर	23.60
8.	फ्रैंक फ्रैंक	50.00
9.	ह्रृग कांग डॉलर	59.40
10.	इटालियन लिरा	98.10
11.	जापानी येन	27.30
12.	मलयेशियन डॉलर	25.80
13.	नार्वेजियन क्रोनर	59.90
14.	पौंड स्ट्रिलिंग	5.7705
15.	स्वीडिश क्रोनर	50.40
16.	स्विस फ्रैंक	19.00
17.	अमरीकी डॉलर	12.32

[संख्या 36/79-स्टाम्प-फा० सं० 33/1/79-बि०कर०(1)]

New Delhi, the 15th November, 1979

S.O. 3855.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 20 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899) and in supersession of the notification of Government of India, in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) No. 24/79-Stamp F. No. 33/1/79-ST (No. S.O. 2843) dated the 8th August, 1979, the Central Government hereby prescribe in column (3) of the Table below the rate of exchange for the conversion of the foreign currency specified in the corresponding entry in column (2) thereof into the currency of India for the purpose of calculating stamp duty.

TABLE

S. No.	Foreign currency	Rate of exchange of foreign currency equivalent to Rs. 100
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	Austrian Schillings	153
2.	Australian Dollars	10.63
3.	Belgian Francs	342
4.	Canadian Dollars	14.26
5.	Danish Kroners	62.00
6.	Deutsche Marks	21.30
7.	Dutch Guilders	23.60
8.	French Francs	50.00
9.	Hong Kong Dollars	59.40
10.	Italian Lire	98.10
11.	Japanese Yen	27.30
12.	Malaysian Dollars	25.80
13.	Norwegian Kroners	59.90
14.	Pound Sterling	5.7705
15.	Swedish Kroners	50.40
16.	Swiss Francs	19.00
17.	U.S.A. Dollars	12.32

[No. 36/79-Stamp-F. No. 33/1/79-ST-(D)]

का० घा० 3856.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 20 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा निर्धारित करती है कि, इन्हीं शुल्क की संगति करने के प्रयोजन से एक रूपी रूबल को भारतीय मुद्रा में संवर्तित करने के लिए, विनिमय की दर 9.9974 रुपये होगी।

[सं० 37/79-स्टाम्प फा० सं० 33/1/79-बि० क० (2)]

S.O. 3856.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (2) of Section 20 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby prescribe that, for the purposes of calculating stamp duty, the rate of exchange for the conversion of one Russian Rouble into Indian currency or vice-versa, shall be Rupees 9.9974.

[No. 37/79-Stamp F. No. 33/1/79-ST]

आदेश

स्टाम्प

का० घा० 3857.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (i) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उन शुल्क को माफ करती है, जो मैसूरु पावर कारपोरेशन द्वारा 1979-80 के लिए गए सोलह करोड़ पचास लाख रुपये मूल्य के ऋण-दरवों पर, उन्हें अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत प्रभार्य है।

[सं० 38/79-स्टाम्प-फा० सं० 33/49/79-बि० क०]

एस० डी० रामास्वामी, भवर सचिव

ORDER
STAMPS

S.O. 3857.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the debentures to the value of Sixteen Crores and Fifty Lakhs of rupees, floated by the Mysore Power Corporation during 1979-80, are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 38/79-Stamp-F. No. 33/49/79-ST]
S. D. RAMASWAMY, Under Secy.

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 12 नवम्बर, 1979

का० घा० 3858.—भारतीय आर्थिक विकास बैंक अधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 18) की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) के उपकारण (ii) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारतीय आर्थिक ऋण और निवेश नियम के अध्यक्ष, श्री एस० एस० मेहता को श्री जेम्स एस० राज के स्थान पर भारतीय आर्थिक विकास बैंक के निदेशक के रूप में लक्ष्य प्रभावी रूप से नामिन करती है।

[मंश्या एफ० 10(107)/मार्फ० एफ०-1/79]

वी० सी० पटनायक, निदेशक

(Department of Economic Affairs)
(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 12th November, 1979

S.O. 3858.—In pursuance of sub-clause (ii) of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the Industrial Development Bank of India Act, 1964 (18 of 1964), the Central Government hereby nominates Shri S. S. Mehta, Chairman, Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation of India, as the director of the Industrial Development Bank of India with immediate effect vice Shri James S. Raj.

[No. F. 10(107)/IF-1/79]

B. C. PATNAIK, Director

३८४

नई दिल्ली, 13 नवम्बर, 1979

कांगा ३८५९.—समुद्री जहाजों की युद्ध जोड़िम वीमा पोजना के पैरा ९ के मन्त्रसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इस प्रधिसूचना के द्वारा ३१ मार्च, १९७६ को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के दौरान युद्ध जोड़िम (समुद्री जहाज) पुनर्वीमा निधि में प्राप्त तथा उसमें से निकाली गई रकमों का लेखा निम्न प्रकार प्रकाशित करती है, प्रथमतः—

31 मार्च, 1976 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के श्रीराज युद्ध जोड़िम (समृद्धि जहाज) पुनर्व्वामा निधि में प्राप्त तथा उसमें से निकाली गयी रकमों का लेखा।

विवरण	प्राप्तिका			विवरण			व्यय
	रकम	मार्च, 1976 के अन्त तक जमा की स्थिति	रकम	मार्च, 1976 के अन्त तक व्यय की स्थिति	रकम	मार्च, 1976 के अन्त तक व्यय की स्थिति	
1	2	3	4	5	6	रु.	रु.
१. बीमा प्रीमियम	3,81,24,244.91	* 12,01,36,158.22	१. (ममुद्दी जहाज) बीमा योजना में नियोजित एजेण्टों के प्रशासनिक खर्च।	† 53,941.85		1,70,270.13	
२. युद्ध जीविम (ममुद्दी जहाज) पुनर्वर्द्धया योजना के पैरा ८(iii) के अन्तर्गत भारत की समेकित निधि से प्रतिम	—	—	२. पैरा ८(iii) के अन्तर्गत युद्ध जीविम (समुद्री जहाज) पुनर्वर्द्धया योजना के अधीन देनदारियों की भद्रायग्नि।	60,69,673.06		62,94,673.06	
			३. पैरा ८(iii) के अन्तर्गत पैण्डियों की आपत्ति	—	—	—	—
			४. विविध व्यय	† 3,000.00		† 24,000.00	
			५. प्रोमियम की आपत्ति	—	—	—	—
			६. पैरा ८(iv) के मतुसार रकमों का निपटान	—	—	—	—
जोड़	3,81,24,244.91	12,01,36,158.22		61,26,614.91		64,88,943.19	

*जैसा कि वर्ष 1974-75 के प्रोफार्मा एकाउण्ट की पहली पाष टिप्पणी में दिखाया गया है वर्ष 1973-74 के 68,96,655.29 रुपए के प्रत्यक्ष का दिसाव वर्ष 1976-77 में दिखाया जाएगा।

††(1) वर्ष 1975-76 में निम्नलिखित प्रदायणियों का प्राधिकार विद्या गया था तथा	पूनार्वित्त	14,283. 45 रु०
	नेशनल	36,064. 55 रु०
	प्रोत्यंटन	3,593. 85 रु०
		6,273. 00 रु०
		60,214. 85 रु०

लेकिन 'ओरियटल' को अदायगी वास्तव में 1975-76 में नहीं की गई थी और इस प्रकार इस वर्ष वास्तविक रूपे 53,941.85 रुपए का दृष्टा 'ओरियटल' को 6,273 रुपए की अदायगी 1976-77 में की गई।

(2) जैसा कि 1974-75 के प्रोफार्म एकाउण्ट की दूसरी पाद टिप्पणी में दिखाया गया है 1974-75 का 37,003 रुपए का बच्चा जिसका महालेखापाल केन्द्रीय राजस्व ने उस वर्ष समाप्तीजन नहीं किया था, वर्ष 1976-77 के लेखाओं में दिखाया जाएगा। यह राशि विन्द मन्त्रालय (राजस्व और बीमा विभाग) द्वारा महालेखापाल, केन्द्रीय, घटवार्ड के नाम 4-3-75 के पत्र संख्या 52(1)इयरोरेंस-1/75 के मन्त्रालय की गई थी।

वर्ष 1974-75 के ब्रोफार्स एकाउंट में विद्युतया गमा क्रमिक जोड़ 21,000.00 रुपए था। वर्ष 1975-76 में 3000 रुपए अचं किए गए इस प्रकार 1975-76 का क्रमिक जोड़ 24,000 रुपए है।

New Delhi, the 13th November, 1979

INSURANCE

S.O. 3859.—In pursuance of paragraph 9 of the Scheme of the War Risks Insurance of Marine Hulls, the Central Government hereby publishes, as follows, in account of the sums received into and paid out of the War Risks (Marine Hulls) Re-insurance Fund during the year ending with the 31st March, 1976, namely :—

Account of the sums received into and paid out of the 'War Risks (Marine Hulls) Re-insurance Fund' during the year ending with 31st March, 1976.

Details	Amount	Progress of receipts upto the end of March, 1976	RECEIPTS		EXPENDITURE	
			Details	Amount	Progress of expenditure upto the end of March, 1976	Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Rs.	Rs.			Rs.	Rs.
1. Insurance Premium	3,81,24,244.91	*12,01,36,158.22	1. Administrative expenses of the Agents employed for War Risks (Marine Hulls) Insurance Scheme.	**53,941.85	1,70,270.13	
2. Advance from the Consolidated Fund of India under paragraph 8(iii) of the War Risks (Marine Hulls) Re-insurance Scheme.	2. Payment of Liabilities under War Risks (Marine Hulls) Re-insurance Scheme under para 8(ii).	60,69,673.06	62,94,673.06	
			3. Re-payment of Advance made under para 8(iii).	
			4. Miscellaneous Expenditure	%3,000.00	%24,000.00	
			5. Refund of Premium	
			6. Sums disposed of in accordance with para 8(iv).	
Total	3,81,24,244.91	12,01,36,158.22		61,26,614.91	64,88,943.19	

*As indicated in the first foot note in the Proforma Accounts for 1974-75, the difference of Rs. 68,96,655.29 for the year 1973-74 will be accounted for in the year 1976-77.

**(1) The following payments were authorised in 1975-76:

Now India	14,283.45
United	36,064.55
National	3,593.85
Oriental	6,273.00
	60,214.85

However, the payment to Oriental, was not actually made in 1975-76 and thus the actual expenditure during the year was Rs. 53,941.85. The payment of Rs. 6,273 to 'Oriental' was made in 1976-77.

(2) As indicated in the second foot-note in the Proforma Accounts for 1974-75 the expenditure of Rs. 37,003 for 1974-75 which was not adjusted by A.G.C.R. in that year will be accounted for in the accounts for the year 1976-77. This amount was sanctioned vide, Ministry of Finance (Dept. of Revenue & Insurance) letter No. 52 (1) Ins. I/75 dated 4-3-1975 to A. G., Central, Bombay.

The progressive total as shown in the Proforma Account for 1974-75 was Rs. 21,000.00. A sum of Rs. 3,000.00 was spent in 1975-76. Thus the progressive total for 1975-76 is Rs. 24,000.

[F. No. 52/(7) Ins.I/77]

मई दिल्ली, 17 नवम्बर, 1979

का० आ० 3860.—जीवन बीमा निगम अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 31) की धारा 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शाकियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एवं द्वारा वित्त मंत्रालय, भार्यिक कार्यवाही विभाग की प्रबन्धनसंचिव कुमारी कुमुम लला की एस० रामनाथन के स्थान पर भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[का० सं० 81(1) बीमा-(4)/78]

भित्र द्वारा द्वेषा, प्रबन्ध संचिव

New Delhi, the 17th November, 1979

S.O. 3860.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956 (31 of 1956) the Central Government hereby appoints Kumari Kusum Lata Mital, Additional Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance as member of the Life Insurance Corporation of India vice Shri S. Ramanathan.

[F. No. 81(1) Ins. (IV)/78]

S. D. RAHEJA, Under Secy.

(भार्यिक कार्यवाही विभाग)

बीमा प्रभाग

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1979

का० आ० 3861.—केन्द्रीय सरकार एवं द्वारा जीवन बीमा निगम अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 31) की धारा 4 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शाकियों ला द्वारा करते हुए भारतीय भ्रीदारिक विभाग के प्रध्यक्ष श्री आर० के० नलचंड का० 31 मार्च, 1980 तक भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम के बोर्ड का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[का० सं० 81 (1) बीमा 4/78]

गदन गोपाल गुल, निवेशक

(Department of Economic Affairs)

Insurance Division

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1979

S.O. 3861.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956 (31 of 1956) the Central Government hereby appoints Shri R. K. Talwar, Chairman, IDBI as Member on the Board of the Life Insurance Corporation of India upto 31-8-1980.

[F. No. 81(1) Ins. IV/78]

M. G. GUPTA, Director

(राजस्व विभाग)
केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड
नई दिल्ली, 6 नवम्बर, 1979
आदेश

का०ग्रा० 3862.—आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43), जिसका इसके बाद अधिनियम के रूप में उल्लेख किया गया है, की धारा 132 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त सत्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, एन्डवारा, निम्नलिखित निरीक्षण उप-निवेशकों तथा सहायक निरीक्षी आयुक्तों को, अधिनियम की धारा 132 की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत कार्यवाही करने के निमित्त प्राप्तिकृत करने का प्रधिकार देता है :—

- (1) निरीक्षण निवेशालय (जांच) में तैनात तथा निरीक्षण निवेशक (जांच) के प्रधीन कार्य कर रहे निरीक्षण उप-निवेशक।
- (2) गुप्त सूचना-पत्रों (विभ.) में तैनात निरीक्षण उप-निवेशक, और
- (3) सहायक निरीक्षी आयकर आयुक्त।

[फा० सं० 414/65/79-आय-कर (जांच)]

(Department of Revenue)
CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES
New Delhi, the 6th November, 1979
ORDERS

S.O. 3862.—In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-section (1) of Section 132 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), hereinafter referred to as the Act, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby empowers the following Deputy Directors of Inspection and Inspecting Asstt. Commissioners to authorise action under sub-section (1) of Section 132 of the Act :—

- (i) The Deputy Directors of Inspection posted in the Directorate of Inspection (Investigation) and working under the Director of Inspection (Investigation).
- (ii) The Deputy Directors of Inspection posted in the Intelligence Wings; and
- (iii) The Inspecting Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax.

[F. No. 414/65/79-I.T. (Inv.)]

का०ग्रा० 3863.—प्रत कर अधिनियम 1957 (1957 का 27), जिसका इसके बाद अधिनियम के रूप में उल्लेख किया गया है, की धारा 37-क की उप-धारा (1) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त सत्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, एन्डवारा, निम्नलिखित निरीक्षण उप-निवेशकों और सहायक निरीक्षी आयुक्तों को अधिनियम की धारा 37-क की उप-धारा (1) के प्रधीन कार्यवाही करने के निमित्त प्राप्तिकृत करने का प्रधिकार देता है :—

- (1) निरीक्षण निवेशालय (जांच) में तैनात और निरीक्षण निवेशक (जांच) के प्रधीन कार्य कर रहे निरीक्षण उप-निवेशक।
- (2) गुप्त सूचना-पत्रों (विभ.) में तैनात निरीक्षण उप-निवेशक, और
- (3) सहायक निरीक्षी आय-कर आयुक्त।

[फा० सं० 414/65/79-आय-कर (जांच)]

विं कु० जगद्वारी, सचिव, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

sioners to authorise action under sub-section (1) of Section 37-A of the Act :—

- (i) The Deputy Directors of Inspection posted in the Directorate of Inspection (Investigation) and working under the Director of Inspection (Investigation).
- (ii) The Deputy Directors of Inspection posted in the Intelligence Wings; and
- (iii) The Inspecting Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax.

[F. No. 414/65/79-I.T. (Inv.)]

V. K. JAGDHARI, Secy.
Central Board of Direct Taxes

नई दिल्ली, 18 मई, 1979

(आय-कर)

का०ग्रा० 3864.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त मकिन्यों का प्रयोग करते हुए, समय-समय पर संशोधित अपनी मध्यमूल्या सं० 679 (फा० सं० 187/2/74-प्रा०क० (ए-1) तारीख 20 जुलाई, 1974 से उपादान अनुमति में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है, प्रथम :—

कम सं० 5 और 5वा के सामने साम्म (1), (2) और (3) के नीचे विद्यमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ देंगे जाएंगी,

अनुसूची

आय-कर आयुक्त	मुद्रालय	अधिकारिता	प्राय-कर आयुक्त
			1
5. मुम्बई नगर-1	मुम्बई	1. कानूनी मकिन	मुम्बई
		2. मुम्बई मकिन	
		3. अवसाय सकिल जिसमें ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों के मामलों पर कारबाही की जाती है जो बृहत् मुम्बई की शेन्वीय प्रधिकारिता के सीनट जिकिला अवसाय या बिलिंग, अधिवक्ता, नालिसीटर, रजिस्ट्रीस्ट ऐक्स-पास, जागत नेकापास आय-कर अवसायी और ईजियर, वास्तुकार और पर्वंव मलाह-कार के अवसाय में लगे हैं।	
5वा. मुम्बई नगर-3	मुम्बई	1. कानूनी मकिन-3, मुम्बई	
		2. विशेष कानूनी सकिल-2 मुम्बई	
		3. X-वार्ड, जिसमें ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों के मामलों पर जो सड़क परिवहन प्रवालक का कारबाह करते हैं और प्राय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 के उपबन्धों के प्रधीन प्रावेश/प्रावेशों द्वारा ममनुविष्ट ऐसे सभी मामलों पर, जिनके कारबाह या अवसाय का प्रमुख स्थान प्राय-कर प्राप्तुन मुम्बई नगर-3 की स्थानीय प्रधिकारिता के	

S.O. 3863.—In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-section (1) of Section 37A of the Wealth Tax Act, 1957 (27 of 1957), hereinafter referred to as the Act, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby empowers the following Deputy Directors of Inspection and Inspecting Assistant Commiss-

1 2 3

भीतर स्थित है और जो आय-कर आयुक्त मुम्बई नगर-3 के प्रभार के अधीन निर्धारित किए गए हैं या निश्चिरणीय हैं या ऐसे निर्धारितियों के सभी सामग्री पर जिनके मामले आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 के उपबंधों या भारतीय आय-कर अधिनियम, 1932 के तत्स्थानी उपबंधों या आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 के किसी उपबंधों के प्रधीन किए गए किसी आवेदन या किसी आवेदनों के आधार पर, आय-कर आयुक्त मुम्बई नगर-3 के प्रभार के अधीन विशेष रूप से समनुविल्पि किए गए हैं, कार्रवाई की जाती है।

4. सर्वेक्षण संकिळ

5. आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 में परिवहित सभी कम्पनियां जिनके कारबाह, व्यवसाय या वृत्ति का प्रमुख्य स्थान निम्नलिखित वार्ड/संकिलों/जिलों की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर है और जिन पर इस समय मुम्बई स्थित किसी आयुक्त की अधिकारिता नहीं है—

- ए-I वार्ड
- ए-II वार्ड
- ए-III वार्ड
- ए-IV वार्ड
- ए-V वार्ड

6. मिसेस-संकिळ

यह अधिसूचना 1-6-1979 से प्रभावी होती।

[सं. 2821 (फा० सं. 187/21/79-भा०क० (ए-1)]

New Delhi, the 18th May, 1979

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 3864.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section(1) of Section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961(43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments to the Schedule appended to its notification No. 679 (F. No. 187/2/74-IT/(AI) dated 20th July, 1974, as amended from time to time.

Existing entries under Columns (1), (2) & (3) against Serial Nos. 5 and 5B shall be substituted by the following entries:—

SCHEDULE

Commissioner of Income tax	Head quarters	Jurisdiction
1	2	3
5. Bombay City-I	Bombay	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Companies Circle-I. Bombay Circle. Professional Circle dealing with cases of all persons engaged in the carrying on of medical profession and profession as lawyers, Advocates, Solicitors, Registered Accountants, Cost Accountants, Income-tax Practitioners and as Engineers, Architects and Management Consultants in the territorial limits of Greater Bombay.
5B. Bombay City-III	Bombay	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Companies Circle-III, Bombay. Foreign Companies Circle II, Bombay. X-Ward dealing with cases of all persons carrying on business as road transport operators and all cases assigned by any order or orders under the provisions of the I.T. Act, 1961 of the assessees having their principal place of business or profession in the territorial jurisdiction of the CIT Bombay City-III, Bombay, and who are assessed or assessable in Commissioner of Income-tax Bombay City-III charge, Bombay or assessee whose cases are specifically assigned to the charge of CIT, Bombay City-III, Bombay, by virtue of any order or orders under the provisions of the I.T. Act, 1961, or under the corresponding provisions of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922, and any other provisions of the I.T. Act, 1961.
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Survey Circle. All Companies as defined in the Income tax Act, 1961 having principal place of business, profession or vocation in the territorial

1

2

3

jurisdiction of the following Wards/Circles/Districts and over which no other Commissioner at Bombay hold jurisdiction at present.

A-I Ward.

A-II Ward.

A-III Ward.

A-IV Ward.

A-V. Ward.

6. Film Circle.

This notification shall take effect from 1-6-1979.

[No. 2821 (F. No. 187/21/79-IT(A-I)]

नई दिल्ली, 3 अक्टूबर, 1979

(ग्राम-कर)

का० घा० 3865.—केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, ग्रामकर प्रधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त जवितयों का प्रयोग करते हुए, समय-समय पर यातांगोंधित प्रपत्ती अधिसूचना सं. 679 (का० सं. 187/2/74-ग्रा० क०(ए-1)], तारीख 29 जुलाई 1974 से संलग्न प्रमुखों में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता हैः—

कम सं. 5B, 5I के सामने स्थाप (1), (2) और (3) के नीचे विवरमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएगीः—

प्रमुखों

ग्रामकर ग्राम्यकर	मुख्यालय	प्रधिकारिता
(1)	(2)	(3)
"5B ग्राम्यकर सिटी III, ग्राम्यकर मुख्यकर	1 कम्पनी सर्किल-III, ग्राम्यकर 2. विवेशी कम्पनी सर्किल-II, ग्राम्यकर	
	3. एकमन्वाड जो सड़क परिवहन प्रवालकों के रूप में कारब्रार चलाने वाले भारी व्यक्तियों के मामले और ग्रामकर प्रधिनियम के उपबंधों के प्रधीन किसी ग्रामेण्या का किन्हीं ग्रामेण्यों द्वारा समनुदेशित उन निर्धारितयों के मामले जिनके कारब्रार या वृत्ति का मुख्य स्थान ग्राम्यकर सिटी-III, ग्राम्यकर के ग्रामकर ग्राम्यकर की प्रादेशिक प्रधिकारिता में स्थित हैं, और जिनका निर्धारण ग्राम्यकर भारतावत, ग्राम्यकर सिटी-III, ग्राम्यकर के ग्रामेण्य हीमा है या हो राकता है या ऐसे निर्धारितयों के मामले, जो ग्रामकर प्रधिनियम, 1961 के उपबंधों के प्रधीन या भारतीय ग्रामकर प्रधिनियम, 1922 के तर्संबंधी उपबंधों के प्रधीन	

(1)

(2)

(3)

या ग्रामकर प्रधिनियम, 1961 के ग्रन्थ उपबंधों के प्रधीन किसी ग्रामेण्या का किन्हीं ग्रामेण्यों के कारब्रार ग्रामकर ग्राम्यकर सिटी-III, ग्राम्यकर के भारतावत की विनियिक्त नियमिति किए जाते हैं, तिपाता है।

4. फिल्म सर्किल, ग्राम्यकर

5. ग्रामकर प्रधिनियम, 1961 में यथा परिभाषित वे सभी कम्पनियाँ जिनके कारब्रार या वृत्ति या ग्रामेण्य का मुख्य स्थान निम्नलिखित वाड़ी/सर्किलों/जिलों की प्रादेशिक प्रधिकारिता में है या जो इस समय ग्राम्यकर में किसी ग्रन्थ ग्राम्यकर की प्रधिकारिता के प्रत्यंगत नहीं है।

ए-1 वार्ड

ए-2 वार्ड

ए-3 वार्ड

ए-4 वार्ड

ए-5 वार्ड

5I ग्राम्यकर सिटी एकम

ग्राम्यकर

1. ग्री-3 वार्ड

2. ग्री-3 वार्ड

3. श्री एम डी (पश्चिम)

4. श्री एस डी (उत्तर)

5. विवेश ग्रन्थावत

6. सर्वोक्षण सर्किल"

यह प्रधिसूचना तारीख 3-10-79 से प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं. 3024 (का० सं. 187/21/79-ग्रा० क०(ए-1))
जै० पी० गर्मी, निवेशक

New Delhi, the 3rd October, 1979

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 3865.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments to the Schedule appended to its Notification No. 697 (F. No. 187/2/74-IT (A)) dated 20th July, 1974 as amended from time to time :—

Existing entries under Columns (1), (2) & (3) against Serial Nos. 5B, 5I shall be substituted by the following entries:—

SCHEDULE

Commissioner of Income-tax	Head-Quarters	Jurisdiction
1	2	3
"5B. Bombay City- III, Bombay	Bombay	1. Companies Circle-III, Bombay. 2. Foreign Companies Circle-II, Bombay.

1	2	3
		केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समाहरण का कार्यालय
		बंगलौर, 16 अगस्त, 1979
		केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क
		कांस्ट्रॉट 3866.—केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क नियमावली 1944 के नियम 5 के प्रत्यार्थ प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं इसके द्वारा केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क के सभी सहायक समाहरणों को, जो कि उन मंडलों के प्रभारी हैं जहाँ वह कारबाना स्थित है, जिससे कि माल निर्यात किया जाता है, व्यापारी नियमिकों द्वारा बंधव-पत्र के अधीन नियर्वात करने की अनुमति देने की शक्ति प्रदान करता है, परन्तु यदि मर्मेंट नियौत्तर इस समाहरणीय के विभिन्न मंडलों में स्थित कारबानों से माल का नियर्वात करना चाहता है तो इस प्रकार की अनुमति समाहरण द्वारा ही प्रदान की जाएगी।
		2. उपरोक्त पैरा (1) में अन्य किसी बात के होते हुए भी, शक्तियों के इस प्रत्यायोजन से तटबर्ती समाहरण की सौजन्य शक्तियों पर, जिनके प्रत्यार्थ वह उस स्थिति में, जबकि नियर्वात एक से अधिक समाहरणीयों से किया जाता हो, इस प्रकार की अनुमति प्रदान करने के लिए पहले ही प्राधिकृत है, किसी प्रकार का प्रयोग नहीं पड़ेगा।
		[केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिसूचना सं. 2/79]
		OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE
		Bangalore, the 16th August, 1979
		CENTRAL EXCISES
		S.O. 3866.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Rule 5 of Central Excise Rules, 1944, I hereby empower all Assistant Collectors of Central Excise in charge of Divisions in which a factory from where goods are to be exported is located, to exercise the powers of the Collector to grant permission to export under Bond by merchant exporters; Provided that if the merchant exporter wants to export goods from factories located in different Divisions of this Collectorate, the permission will be granted by the Collector.
		2. Notwithstanding anything contained in para (1) above, this delegation will not in any way affect the existing powers of the Maritime Collector who is already authorised to grant such permission when exports are made from more than one Collectorate.
		[Central Excise Notification No. 2/79]
		बंगलौर, 14 सितम्बर, 1979
		कांस्ट्रॉट 3867.—केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क नियमावली 1944 के नियम 233 के प्रत्यार्थ प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, कर्नाटक, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समाहरणीय बंगलौर के समाहरणीय, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क समाहरणीय कर्नाटक के अधिकार शेष के अन्तर्गत आने वाले शुल्क योग्य माल के नियमावलों द्वारा अनुमति करने के लिए नियन्त्रित अनुप्रकृति हितायते जारी करते हैं।
		2. प्रत्येक उत्पादन शुल्क माल का नियमावली, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क नियमावली 1944 के नियम 53 और 47, उक्त नियमावली के नियम 173 (जी) के साथ पठित, के प्रत्यार्थ नियर्वात क्रमांक: फार्म आर जी-1 तथा ५० ली ४ में भ्रमा से एक दैनिक स्टॉक लेखा और प्रविष्टि पुस्तक रखेगा किसी उत्पादन शुल्क माल के नियमित होने के तत्काल बाबू आर जी-1 रजिस्टर में उक्तकी प्रविष्टि की जानी चाहिए। नियमावली उसी दिन, जिस दिन (केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क नियमावली 1944 के नियम 47 के प्रत्यार्थ अनुमोदित), उत्पादन शुल्क माल स्टोर रूम में या अन्य स्थान पर जमा किया जाते हैं, या बहाँ से निकाले जाते हैं, ५० ली ० ४ के उचित कालम में, ऐसी जमा या निकाले जाने, की तारीख, पूरा अविवारण, माला बजन और इस प्रकार जमा या निकाले गये माल की कीमत, संख्या,

51. Bombay Bombay
City-X

1. C-III, Ward.
2. B-III, Ward.
3. B.S.D. (West).
4. B.S.D. (North).
5. Foreign Section.
6. Survey Circle.

This notification shall take effect from 3-10-79.

[No. 3024 (F. No. 187/21/79-I.T.(A-I)]

J. P. SHARMA Director

निन्ह, और पैकेजों की संख्या (यदि कोई हो) जिसमें वे अन्तर्विष्ट हैं, लिखेगा और प्रतिष्ठित करेगा। निम्नांत मार्जी 1 के घोर ई०वी० 4 के सभी कालामों को पूरी तरह से और उस विधि से भरेगा जैसा कि उक्त नियमावली में उपवर्णित तथा तदीन निर्धारित कामों में बताया गया है।

[निम्नों उत्पाद शुल्क अधिसूचना सं० 4/79]
पारा० एन० शुक्ला, समाहर्ता

Bangalore, the 14th September, 1979

S.O. 3867.—In exercise of the powers conferred under Rule 233 of Central Excise Rules, 1944, the Collector of Central Excise, Karnataka Central Excise Collectorate, Bangalore hereby issues the following supplemental Instructions for compliance by the manufacturers of excisable goods within the jurisdiction of the Karnataka Central Excise Collectorate.

2. Every manufacturer of excisable goods shall maintain a daily stock Account and on Entry Book separately in the Form R.G. 1 and E.B. 4 prescribed under Rule 53 and 47 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944 respectively read with Rule 173(G) of the said Rules. Immediately after any excisable goods are manufactured, entry should be made in the R.G. 1 Register. Manufacturers shall on the same day on which excisable goods are deposited in or removed from the Store room or other place of storage approved under Rule 47 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, write and enter in the proper column of the E. B. 4, the date of such deposit, or removal, the full description, quantity, weight, and value of the goods so deposited or removed, the number of and the marks and number of the packages (if any) in which they are contained. Manufacturers shall fill up all the column of the R.G. 1 and E.B. 4, in full in the manner laid in the said Rules and forms prescribed thereunder.

[Central Excise Notification No. 4/79]
R. N. SHUKLA, Collector

वाणिज्य एवं नागरिक आपूर्ति भवालय (वाणिज्य विभाग)

संघरक्षण नियंत्रण, आयात-नियर्ति का कार्यालय
लाइसेंस रद्द करने का आवेदन
नई दिल्ली, 24 सितम्बर, 1979

कानूना० 3868.—सर्वश्री एवालियर केबल्स एण्ड कन्वेक्टर्स लिं०, नई दिल्ली के नाम में 15,739 रुपए के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या-पी/एल/2862594/सी/एक्स/एक्स/69/डी/78, दिनांक 29-11-1978 जारी किया गया था और जो बाद में नीति पुस्तक 1977-78 (जिल्हा-2) के खण्ड-1 भाग-ब की कंडिका 31(2), 31(3), 32(2) और 38 की शर्तों के अनुसार पी०वी०सी० रेजिन का आयात करने के लिए आयात (नियंत्रण) आवेदन, 1955 की धारा-5(3) (1) के अन्तर्गत मनोनीत विनिमयात सर्वश्री अनत ज्ञासमा प्रा०सि०, शी०-96 बैंगलुरु, इंडियन एसिया, विल्सों को 1-2-79 को हस्तातरण कर दिया था।

मनोनीत फर्म जो कि लाइसेंसधारी है, ने बताया है कि मूल लाइसेंस की दोनों मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति और सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति किसी भी सीमा शुल्क प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत कराए बिना और पूर्ण रूप से उपयोग में लाए बिना ही उनसे खो गई/प्रस्थानस्थ हो गई है। उक्त विवरण के समर्थन में मनोनीत फर्म ने आयात-नियर्ति क्रियाविधि 1979-80 की हँडुक की कंडिका 334 में वी गई शर्तों के अनुसार एक शपथपत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि लाइसेंस की दोनों मूल प्रतियां मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति और सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति मनोनीत फर्म द्वारा खो गई/प्रस्थानस्थ हो गई हैं।

यथासंशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 की धारा 9 (सी) के अन्तर्गत प्रवत्त प्रविकारों का उपयोग करते हुए मैं एतद्वारा

उक्त मूल लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एल/2862594/सी/एक्स/एक्स/69/डी/78, दिनांक 29-11-1978 की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति और सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति को रद्द करने का आदेश देता हूँ।

आयात नियर्ति क्रियाविधि पुस्तका 1979-80 की कंडिका 335 और 336 की शर्तों के अनुसार मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति और सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति दोनों की मुद्रिति प्रति पार्टी को जारी की जाएगी।

[संख्या ईजी-136/एजे-77/डी/प्राई डी ए/ सी ए/421]

के० शी० औद्धरी, उप-मुद्रा विनियम, आयात-नियर्ति
हते संघरक्षण शुल्क नियंत्रक, आयात नियर्ति

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE & CIVIL SUPPLIES

(Department of Commerce)

OFFICE OF THE JT. CHIEF CONTROLLER OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

CANCELLATION ORDER

New Delhi, the 24th September, 1979

S.O. 3868.—Import Licence No. P/L/2862594/C/XX/69/D/78 dated 29-11-78 for Rs. 15,739 was issued in the name of M/s. Gwalior Cables & Conductors Ltd., New Delhi and subsequently transferred on 1-2-79 to the nominee manufacturer, M/s. Anant Plasma Pvt. Ltd., B-96, Wazirpur, Industrial Area, Delhi under clause 5(3)(1) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 for import of P.V.C. Resin as per provisions in Paras 31(2), 31(3), 32(2) and 38 of Part 'B' Section I of the Policy Book 1977-78 (Vol. II).

The nominee firm, who is the holder of the licence, has stated that both the Exchange Control and Customs Purpose Copies of the original licence has been lost/misplaced by him without having been registered with any customs authority and fully unutilised. In support of the above statement the nominee firm has produced an affidavit as per provision in Para 334 of the Hand Book of Import Export Procedures 1979-80. I am satisfied that both the original Exchange Control Copy and Customs Purpose Copy of the licence has been lost/misplaced by the nominee firm.

In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Clause 9(CC) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955 dated 7-12-55 as amended, I hereby order the cancellation of the original Exchange Control and Customs Purpose Copies of the above original licence No. P/L/2862594/C/XX/69-D/78 dated 29-11-78.

A duplicate licence both Exchange Control and Customs Purpose Copies will be issued to the party in accordance with the provisions in Para 335 and 336 of the Hand Book of Import Export Procedures 1979-80.

[No. Engg. 136/AJ-77/EP/IDA/CLA/421]

K. B. CHAUDHARY,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports,
for Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

आवेदन

मद्रास, 4 अक्टूबर, 1979

विषय:—सर्वश्री कोरोमडेल इन्डिया प्रोडक्ट्स (प्रा०) लि०, मद्रास-19 को अप्रैल—मार्च-79 अवधि के लिए परिशिष्ट-5 की कम संख्या-126 (10) के अन्तर्गत कार्बनरसल आयात करने के लिए 3,99,652 रुपए के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या-पी/एस/1883586/सी/एक्सएक्स/68/एम/78, दिनांक 14-7-78 को रद्द करना।

कानूना० 3869.—सर्वश्री कोरोमडेल इन्डिया प्रोडक्ट्स (प्रा०) लि०, 23 इलापा थोप्पु फर्स्ट स्ट्रीट, कालाविपेट, त्रिश्वालैयूर, मद्रास-19 को अप्रैल—मार्च-79 अवधि के लिए कार्बनरसल आयात करने के लिए 3,99,652 रुपए का आयात लाइसेंस संख्या-पी/एस/1883586/सी/एक्सएक्स/68/एम/78 दिनांक 14-7-78, जारी किया गया था। लाइसेंसधारी ने उक्त

लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रति जारी करने का प्रावेदन इसलिए किया है क्योंकि वह किसी भी सीमा-शुल्क प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत कराए बिना और विल्कुल उपयोग में लाए बिना ही खो गई/प्रस्थानस्थ हो गई है। प्रावेदक ने प्रत्यने तक के समर्थन में एक शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है।

मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि भायात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1883586/सी/एक्स एक्स/68/एस/78, दिनांक 14-7-78 की मूल प्रति खो गई/प्रस्थानस्थ हो गई है और निवेदा देता हूँ कि प्रावेदक को उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रति जारी की जाए। उक्त भायात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1883586/सी/एक्स एक्स/68/एम/78, दिनांक 14-7-78 की मूल प्रति एतद्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

[संख्या एस आई/18(10)/19/एम/79/एम-3]
टॉ.एन. वेंकटेशवारन, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, भायात-नियर्यात
हते संपुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, भायात-नियर्यात

ORDER

Madras, the 4th October, 1979

Sub : Cancellation of import licence No. P/S/1883586/C/XX/68/M/78 dated 14-7-78 for Rs. 3,99,652 for the period April—March, 1979 for the import of Carbaryl S. No. 126(10) of App. 5 to M/s. Coromandel Indag Products (P) Ltd., Madras-19.

S.O. 3869.—M/s Coromandel Indag Products (P) Ltd., 23, Iluppa Thoppu 1st Street, Kaladipet, Tiruvottiyur, Madras-19, was issued with an import licence No. P/S/1883586/C/XX/68/M/78 dated 14-7-78 for Rs. 3,99,652 for the import of Carbaryl for the period April—March, 1979. The licensee has since applied for a duplicate Customs copy of the above licence since the same has been lost/misplaced without having been registered with any Customs Authority and utilised it at all. In support of their contention the applicant has filed an affidavit.

I am satisfied that the original import licence No. P/S/1883586/C/XX/68/M/78 dated 14-7-78 has been lost/misplaced and direct that a duplicate Customs copy of the above import licence, shall be issued to the applicant. The original copy of the above import licence No. P/S/1883586/C/XX/68/M/78 dated 14-7-78 is hereby cancelled.

[No. S. I/18(10)/19/A.M. 79/AU-III]

T. N. VENKATESWARAN, Dy. Chief Controller
of Imports & Exports
for Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports

लाइसेंस रद्द करने का प्रावेदन

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1979

का० प्रा० 3870.—सर्वश्री प्राइवेल इंडस्ट्रीज, 111-ओखला इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली को चमड़ा भायात करने के लिए 10,000 रुपए का भायात लाइसेंस सं० पी/एस/1921431/सी/एक्स एक्स/72/डी/79, दिनांक 26-7-79 प्रवान किया गया था। उक्तोंमें हैंड बूक मियम एवं कियाविधि, 1979-80 की कंडिका 334 के अन्तर्गत एक शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया था जिसके प्रत्यक्षत उक्तोंमें अनाया है कि ग्रन्ति—मार्ग 80 प्रवधि के लिए 10,000 रुपए के लिए भायात लाइसेंस सं० पी/एस/1921431, दिनांक 26-7-79 की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति किसी भी सीमा-शुल्क प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत कराए बिना और विल्कुल उपयोग में लाए बिना खो गई/प्रस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

2. मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति खो गई/प्रस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

3. भव्यतत यथा संशोधित भायात नियंत्रण भावेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की धारा 9 (मी सी) के अन्तर्गत प्रवल्ल प्रधिकारों का उपयोग करते हुए 10,000 रुपए के लिए उक्त लाइसेंस सं० पी/एस/1921431, दिनांक 26-7-79 की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति एतद्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

4. भायात-नियर्यात प्रक्रिया पुस्तिका 1979-80 की कंडिका 334 में दी गई व्यवस्था के अनुसार 10,000 रुपए के लिए भायात लाइसेंस सं० पी/एस/1921431, दिनांक 26-7-79 की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रति प्रावेदक को भ्रष्ट जारी की जा रही है।

[सं० 1/नाम-सी जी डी डी/नान-एस आई एस आई/एम-80/एम-2/पी एल ए]

के० रमन, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक भायात-नियर्यात हते संपुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, भायात-नियर्यात

CANCELLATION ORDER

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1979

S.O. 3870.—M/s. Ideal Industries, 111-Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi were granted import licence No. P/S/1921431/C/XX/72/D/79 dated 26-7-1979, for Rs. 10,000 for import of Leather. They have filed an affidavit as required under Para 334 of Hand Book of Rules & Procedure, 1979-80 wherein they have stated that custom purpose copy of import licence No. P/S/1921431 dated 26-7-1979 for Rs. 10,000 for AM-80 period has been lost/misplaced without having been registered with any customs authority and utilised at all.

2. I am satisfied that the custom purpose copy of the said licence has been lost/misplaced.

3. In exercise of the powers conferred on me under clause 9(cc) in the Import Trade Control Order 1955 dated 7-12-55 as amended upto date, the custom purpose copy of the said licence No. P/S/1921431 dated 26-7-1979 for Rs. 10,000 is hereby cancelled.

4. The applicant is now being issued duplicate custom purpose copy of import licence No. P/S/1921431 dated 26-7-79 for Rs. 10,000 in accordance with the provision of Para 334 of Hand Book of Import-Export Procedure, 1979-80.

[No. 1/Non-DGTD/Non-SISI/AM-80/AU-II/CLA]

K. RAMAN, Dy. Chief Controller
of Imports & Exports

for Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports

लाइसेंस रद्द करने का प्रावेदन

नई दिल्ली, 14 नवम्बर, 1979

का० प्रा० 3871.—सर्वश्री मुनाबार शाह एज्ड सन्स, दी बंड, श्रीतंगर (जम्मू और कश्मीर) को केवल फिल्मिंग टैक्स और इसके उपसाधनों के भायात के लिए 10,000 रुपए भायात बीमा-माड़ा मूल्य का एक भायात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/ए/1434545/सी/एक्स एक्स/65/एच/77, दिनांक 19-11-1977 प्रदान किया गया था जो जारी करने की तिथि से 24 मास के लिए वैध था। अब पार्टी ने उपर्युक्त भायात लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति के लिए इस भायात पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल प्रति उक्तोंमें खो गई/प्रस्थानस्थ हो गई है। पार्टी ने भायात भावार नियंत्रण के अनुसार एक भ्रावशयक रूप से उपयोग हो चुका था। लाइसेंस के मध्ये केवल 2,100 रुपए शेष हैं। शपथ-पत्र में यह भी कहा गया है कि यदि भायात लाइसेंस की उक्त मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति बाब में मिल गई था प्राप्त हो गई तो वह जारीकर्ता प्राधिकारियों को लोटा दी जाएगी। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि भायात लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई/प्रस्थानस्थ हो गई है और निकेतन देता हूँ कि प्रावेदक को भायात लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति जारी की जाए। भायात लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति एतद्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

[संख्या 12/583/78-77/एमएल-I/461]

राम्भन्दर सिंह,

उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, भायात-नियर्यात
हते मुख्य नियंत्रक, भायात-नियर्यात

**OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CONTROLLER OF IMPORTS
& EXPORTS**

CANCELLATION ORDER

New Delhi, the 14th November, 1979

S.O. 3871.—M/s. Munawar Shah and Sons, The Bund, Srinagar (J&K) were granted an import licence No. P/A/1434545/C/XX/65/H/77 dated 19-11-1977 for a C.I.F. value of Rs. 10,000 only for Import of Fishing Tackles and its accessories valid for 24 months from the date of issue. Now the party has applied for grant of Duplicate Exchange Control copy for the aforesaid import licence on the ground that the original one has been lost/misplaced by them. The party has furnished necessary affidavit as per I.T.C. rules according to which the aforesaid import licence was registered with the Customs House, Foreign Post, New Delhi and was utilised partly and the balance against the licence is Rs. 2,100 only. It has also been incorporated in the affidavit that if the said Exchange Control copy of the import licence is traced or found later on, it will be returned to the issuing authority. I am satisfied that the original Exchange Control copy of the Import licence has been lost/misplaced and direct that a Duplicate Exchange Control copy of the import licence should be issued to the applicant. The original Exchange Control copy of the import licence is hereby cancelled.

[File No. 12/583/76-77/ML-I/461]

RAJINDER SINGH, Dy. Chief Controller
of Imports & Exports
for Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

(नागरिक पूर्ण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 1979

का० 3872.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, अधिम संविदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 5 के तहत कानपुर कमोडिटी एक्सचेंज लि०, कानपुर द्वारा भाव्यता के नवीकरण के लिए किये गये आवेदन पर वायदा बाजार आयोग के परामर्श से विचार करके मौर यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना व्यापार के हित में तथा लोकहित में भी होगा, एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त एक्सचेंज को गुड़ की अधिम संविदाओं के बारे में 26 नवम्बर, 1979 से 25 नवम्बर, 1982 तक (जिसमें ये दोनों दिन भी सम्मिलित हैं) की तीन वर्ष की अतिरिक्त कालावधि के लिए मान्यता प्रदान करता है।

2. एतद्वारा प्रदत्त मान्यता इस शर्त के अधीन है कि उक्त एक्सचेंज ऐसे निवेशों का अनुपालन करेगा जो वायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय-समय पर दिये जाएं।

[एफ० सं० 12(1)-आई०टी०/79]

(Department of Civil Supplies)

New Delhi, the 15th November, 1979

S.O. 3872.—The Central Government, in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission, having considered the application for renewal of recognition made under Section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952) by the Kanpur Commodity Exchange Ltd., Kanpur, and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do, hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Exchange for a further period of three years from the 26th November, 1979 to the 25th November, 1982 (both days inclusive) in respect of forward contracts in gur.

2. The recognition hereby granted is subject to the condition that the said Exchange shall comply with such directions as may from time to time be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[File No. 12(1)-IT/79]

का० 3873.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, अधिम संविदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 5 के तहत सेंट्रल इंडिया कमोडिटी एक्सचेंज लि०, खालिपर द्वारा भाव्यता के नवीकरण के लिए किये गये आवेदन पर वायदा बाजार आयोग के परामर्श से विचार करके और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना व्यापार के हित में तथा लोकहित में भी होगा, एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त एक्सचेंज को गुड़ की अधिम संविदाओं के बारे में 26 नवम्बर, 1979 से 25 नवम्बर, 1982 तक (जिसमें ये दोनों दिन भी सम्मिलित हैं) की तीन वर्ष की अतिरिक्त कालावधि के लिए मान्यता प्रदान करती है।

2. एतद्वारा प्रदत्त मान्यता इस शर्त के अधीन है कि उक्त एक्सचेंज ऐसे निवेशों का अनुपालन करेगा जो वायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय-समय पर दिये जाएं।

[एफ० सं० 12(1)-आई०टी०/79]

S.O. 3873.—The Central Government, in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission, having considered the application for renewal of recognition made under section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952), by the Central India Commercial Exchange Ltd., Gwalior, and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do, hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Exchange for a further period of 3 years from the 26th November, 1979 to the 25th November, 1982 (both days inclusive) in respect of forward contracts in gur.

2. The recognition hereby granted is subject to the condition that the said Exchange shall comply with such directions as may, from time to time, be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[F. No. 12(1)-IT/79]

का० 3874.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, अधिम संविदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 5 के तहत सुरेन्द्रनगर काट्टम भायल एण्ड ओयल सीसीएस एसोसियेशन लि०, सुरेन्द्रनगर द्वारा भाव्यता के नवीकरण के लिए किये गये आवेदन पर वायदा बाजार आयोग के परामर्श से विचार करके और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना व्यापार के हित में तथा लोकहित में भी होगा, एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त एक्सचेंज को कपास की अधिम संविदाओं के बारे में 11 दिसम्बर, 1979 से 10 दिसम्बर, 1982 (जिसमें ये दोनों दिन भी सम्मिलित हैं) की तीन वर्ष की अतिरिक्त कालावधि के लिए मान्यता प्रदान करती है।

2. एतद्वारा प्रदत्त मान्यता इस शर्त के अधीन है कि उक्त एक्सचेंज ऐसे निवेशों का अनुपालन करेगा जो वायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय-समय पर दिये जाएं।

[एफ० सं० 12(3)-आई०टी०/79]

S.O. 3874.—The Central Government, having considered in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission, the application for renewal of recognition made under Section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952), by the Surendranagar Cotton Oil and Oilseeds Association Limited, Surendranagar, and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do, hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Association for a further period of three years from the 11th December, 1979 to the 10th December, 1982 (both days inclusive), in respect of forward contracts in cotton.

2. The recognition hereby granted is subject to the condition that the said Association shall comply with such directions, as may, from time to time, be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[F. No. 12(3)-IT/79]

क्रा० आ० 3875.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, प्रथिम संविधा (विनियम) प्रधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 5 के अधीन कानपुर कामो-डिटी एक्सचेंज लिंग, कानपुर द्वारा मान्यता के नवीकरण के लिए यिए आवेदन पर वायदा बाजार आयोग के परामर्श से विचार करके और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना व्यापार के हित में और लोकहित में भी हीला, एतद्वारा उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 6 के द्वारा प्रदत्त प्रक्रियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त एक्सचेंज को प्रसंसी की प्रथिम संविधाओं के बारे में 27 नवम्बर, 1979 से 26 नवम्बर, 1982 तक (जिसमें ये दोनों दिन भी सम्मिलित हैं) की तीन वर्षों की प्रतिरिक्षित कालावधि के लिए मान्यता प्रदान करती है।

2. एतद्वारा प्रदत्त मान्यता इस भार्त के अधीन है कि उक्त एक्सचेंज ऐसे निवेशों का अनुपालन करेगा जो वायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय-समय पर यिए जायें।

[एक० सं० 12(5)-प्राई ईटी/79]
क० एक० मैथ्यू, उपसचिव

[File No. 12(5)-IT/79]

K. S. MATHEW, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 6 नवम्बर 1979

भारतीय मानक संस्था

क्रा० आ० 3876.—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक मंस्त्रा (प्रमाणन चिह्न) के विनियम, 1955 के विनियम 14 के अनुसार भारतीय मानक मंस्त्रा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि लाइसेंस संख्या मी एम/एल-2285, जिसके ब्यौरे नीचे अनुसृती में दिए गए हैं। IS : 3035 को वापस ले सके के कारण 1979-01-01 से रद्द कर दिया गया है।

अनुसृती

क्रम लाइसेंस संख्या भौतिक तिथि	लाइसेंस धारी का नाम भौतिक पता	रद्द किए गए लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु/प्रक्रिया	सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानकम	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. मी एम/एल-2285 1970-03-30	मेसर्ट एशियन केबल्स कारपरेशन लिंग, पोखरन रोड, पोस्ट बॉक्स संख्या-11 ठाणे *(महा- राष्ट्र)	लाइनमध्य रोधित अनुसृह केबल --- लिंग, पोखरन रोड, पोस्ट बॉक्स संख्या-11 ठाणे *(महा- राष्ट्र)	1. पांच और पाँच वीं सी खोलबाल 250/440 बोल्ट और 650/1100 बोल्ट प्रेड, एनुमिनियम चालकों सहित 2. पालीइथालीन रोधित टेप लगे ब्रेड घड़े और सहगिलित 250/440 बोल्ट और 650/1100, बोल्ट प्रेड, एनुमिनियम चालकों सहित, और 3. पालीइथालीन रोधित और पालीइथालीन खोलदार 250/440 बोल्ट और 650/ 1100 बोल्ट प्रेड एनुमिनियम चालकों सहित मार्को : "एशियन"	IS : 3035 (भाग I)—1965 लापनमध्य रोधित अनुसृह केबल विना पांच और सी खोल बाले और पाँच और सी खोल बाले का विशिष्टि IS : 3035 (भाग II)—1965 लापनमध्य, रोधित अनुसृह केबल, पालीइथालीन रोधित टेप लगे अथवा टेप रहित ब्रेड चड़े भौतिक सहगिलित, की विशिष्टि IS : 3035 (भाग III)—1967 लापनमध्य रोधित अनुसृह केबल, पालीइथालीन रोधित और पालीइथालीन खोलदार की विशिष्टि

[सं० सी एम उ/55 : 2285]

New Delhi, the 6th November, 1979

INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION

S.O. 3876.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations 1955 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that Licence No. CM/L-2285 particulars of which are given in the Schedule below has been cancelled with effect from 79-01-01 on account of withdrawal of IS:3035.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date No.	Name & Address of the licensee	Article/Process covered by the licence cancelled.	Relevant Indian Standards
1	2	3	4	5
1.	CM/L-2285 1970-03-30	M/s. Asian Cables Corporation Ltd., Pokhran Road, Post box No. 11 Thana (Maharashtra)	Thermoplastic insulated weather proof cables : 1. PVC insulated and PVC sheathed weather proof cables PVC sheathed 250/440 volts and 650/ 1100 volts grade with aluminium conductors 2. Polyethylene insulated, taped braided and compounded, 250/440 volts and 650/1100 volts grade with aluminium conductors, and 3. Polyethylene insulated and polyethylen sheathed, 250/ 440 volts and 60/1100 volts grade with aluminium conductors Brand : 'ASIAN'	IS: 3035 (Pt I)—1965 Specification for thermoplastic insulation 1. PVC insulated and PVC sheathed weather proof cables PVC sheathed 250/440 volts and 650/ 1100 volts grade with aluminium conductors. 2. IS: 3035 (Pt II)—Specification for thermoplastic insulated weather proof cables, polyethylene insulated, taped or untaped, braided and compounded. 3. IS: 3035 (Pt III)—1967 Specifi- cation for thermoplastic insu- lated weatherproof cables, polyethylene insulated and polyethylen sheathed.

[No. CMD/55:2285]

नई दिल्ली, 1979-11-08

क्रा० ३८७७ --प्रमय-समय पर संगोष्ठि भारतीय मानक मंस्तक (प्रमाणन चिह्न) के विनियम, 1955 के विनियम 5 के उपविनियम (1) के भनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था का और से प्रधिसूचित किया जाता है कि भारतीय मानक जिनके ब्यौरे इसके बाद नीचे भनुसारों में दिए गए हैं रद्द कर दिए गए हैं प्रीर 19-10-79 से वापस माने जाएं।

भनुसारों

क्रम रद्द किए गए भारतीय मानक की संख्या	शीर्षक	जिसमें भारतीय मानक की स्थापना छपी थी	विवरण
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. IS: 2106 (भाग 3)—1963 इलेक्ट्रॉनिक विषय उपकरणों के बातावरणीय परीक्षण भाग 3 शीत परीक्षण	भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2 खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) दिनांक 1963-06-22 में एस ओ संख्या 1683,	IS: 9000 (भाग 2/खण्ड 1 से 4)—1977 के प्रकाशन के फलस्वरूप	
2. IS: 2106 (भाग 4)—1963 हरेक्ट्रॉनिक और विष्यु उपकरणों के बातावरणीय परीक्षण भाग 4 शुष्क ताप परीक्षण			IS: 9000 (भाग 3/खण्ड 1-5)—1977 के प्रकाशन के फलस्वरूप
3. IS: 2106 (भाग 6)—1965 इलेक्ट्रॉनिक और विष्यु उपकरणों के लिए बातावरणीय परीक्षण भाग 6 शुष्क ताप परिवर्तन	भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खण्ड-3, उपखण्ड (ii) दिनांक 1965-10-02 में एस ओ संख्या 3059	IS: 9000 (भाग 14)—1978 के प्रकाशन के फलस्वरूप	
	1965-09-21	के अधीन प्रकाशित	

[स० सी एस ओ/13 : 7]

New Delhi, the 8th November, 1979

S.O. 3877.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 5 of the Indian Standard Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations 1955 as amended from time to time, it is hereby, notified that the Indian Standard(s), particulars of which are mentioned in the Schedule given hereafter, have been cancelled and stands withdrawn with effect from 1979-10-01

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Title of the Indian Standard	S.O. No. & Date of the Gazette Notification in which Establishment of the Indian Standard was Notified	Remarks
No.	Cancelled		
1	2	3	4
1.	IS: 2106 (Part III)-1963 Environmental tests for electronic and electrical equipment Part III Cold test	S.O. 1683 dated 1963-06-10 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section-3 Sub-section (ii) dated 1963-06-22	Consequent upon the publication of IS: 9000 (Part II/Sec. 1 to 4) 1977
2.	IS: 2106 (Part IV)-1963 Environmental tests for electronic and electrical equipment : Part IV Dry heat test.	-do-	Consequent upon the publication of IS: 9000 (Part III/Sec. 1 to 5)—1977
3.	IS: 2106 (Part VI)-1965 Environmental tests for electronic and electrical equipment: Part VI Rapid change of temperature	S.O. 3059 dated 1965-09-21 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section-3, Sub-section (ii) dated 1965-10-02	Consequent upon the publication of IS: 9000 (Part XIV)—1978

[No. CMD/13 : 7]

का० आ० 3878—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) के विनियम 1955 के उपविनियम (1) के अनुसार आ० मा० संस्था को और से प्रधिसूचित किया जाता है कि भारतीय मानक जिसके ब्यौरे नीचे अनुसूची में विए गए हैं, रद्द कर दिया गया है और वह उसे वापस माना जाए।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	रद्द किए गए भारतीय मानक की पद संख्या और शीर्षक	राजपत्र अधिसूचना की एस और म० और तिथि जिसमें भारतीय मानक की स्थापना लिखी थी	विवरण
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS : 5156—1969 रंगमापी कप, दुबोस्क टाइप	भारत के राजपत्र भाग II खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) वस्तु के अप्रचलित होने के फलस्वरूप विनांक 1969-12-06 में एस और संख्या 4848 विनांक 1969-11-19 के अधीन प्रकाशित	[सं० सी एम डी/13 : 7]

S.O. 3373.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 5 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations 1955 as amended from time to time, it is, hereby, notified that the Indian Standard, particulars of which is mentioned in the Schedule given hereafter, has been cancelled and stands withdrawn :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No. & Title of the Indian Standard Cancelled No.	S.O. No. & Date of the Gazette Notification in which establishment of the Indian Standard was notified.	Remarks	
1	2	3	4
1. IS: 5156-1969 Specification for Colorimeter Cup, Duboscq type.	S.O. 4848 dated 1969-11-19 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated 1969-12-06.	As this item has become obsolete	[No. CMD/13:7]

का० आ० 3879.—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) के विनियम 1955 के उपविनियम (1) के अनुसार आ० मा० संस्था को और से एतद्वारा प्रधिसूचित किया जाता है कि भारतीय मानक जिसके ब्यौरे इसके बाब नीचे अनुसूची में विए गए हैं, रद्द कर दिया गया है और वह उसे वापस माना जाए।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	रद्द किए गए भारतीय मानक की पद संख्या भारत के राजपत्र की एस और संख्या और शीर्षक	विवरण	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. IS : 5407—1969 अमोनियम फॉस्फेट सल्फेट वानेदार (19.5—19.5—0)	भारत के राजपत्र भाग II, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) विनांक 1970-11-01 में एस और संख्या 3561 विनांक 1970-10-16 के अधीन प्रकाशित	IS: 4830—1979 के प्रकाशन के फलस्वरूप	[सं० सी एम डी/13 : 7]

S.O. 3879.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 5 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955 as amended from time to time, it is, hereby, notified that the Indian Standard, particulars of which is mentioned in the Schedule given hereafter, has been cancelled and stands withdrawn:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No. & Title of the Indian Standard Cancelled No.	S. O. No. and Date of the Gazette Notification In which establishment of the Indian Standard was Notified.	Remarks	
1	2	3	4
1. IS:5407-1959 Specification for ammonium phosphate sulphate granular (19.5-19.5-0)	S.O. 3561 dated 1970-10-16 published in the gazette of India, Part, II, Section-3, Sub-Section (ii) dated 1970-11-07	Consequent upon the publication of IS:4830—1979	[No. CMD/13:7]

का० घा० 3880.—समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) के विनियम 1955 विनियम (4) के उपविनियम (1) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था की ओर से अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिस मानक चिह्न को डिजाइन प्रीर उसके शास्त्रिक विवरण तथा तत्सम्बन्धी भारतीय मानक के शीर्षक सहित नीचे अनुसूची में दी गई है वे भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा निर्धारित की गई है।

भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) अधिनियम 1952 और उसके प्रधीन बने नियमों के निमित्त ये मानक चिह्न 1979-09-16 से लागू होगा।

अनुसूची

क्रम मानक चिह्न की डिजाइन	उत्पाद/उत्पाद की श्रेणी	तत्सम्बन्धी भारतीय मानक की पद संख्या और मानक चिह्न की डिजाइन का शास्त्रिक विवरण
संख्या		शीर्षक

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	IS:299	एलुमिनो-लौहिक	IS : 299—1975 एलुमिनो लौहिक को विशिष्ट टिट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	भारतीय मानक संस्था का मोनोग्राम जिसमें "ISI" शब्द होते हैं स्तम्भ (2) में दिखाई गई शैली और अनुपात में तैयार किया गया है और ऐसा डिजाइन में दिखाया गया है मोनोग्राम के ऊपर की ओर भारतीय मानक की पदसंख्या दी गई है।

[स० सी एम डी/13 : 9]

S.O. 3880.—In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, 1955 the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that the Standard Marks designed of which together with the verbal description of the design and the title of the relevant Indian Standard is given in the Schedule here to annexed, has been specified.

This Standard Mark for the purpose of the Indian Standard Intititution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 and the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from 1979-09-16 :

SCHEDULE

S. Design of the standard No.	Product/Class of Product		No. and Title of the Relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the Design of the Standard Mark
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	Alumino-ferric	IS:299-1975 Specification for Alumino-ferric (second revision)	IS:299-1975 Specification for Alumino-ferric (second revision)	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters "ISI" drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in Col. (2); the number of the Indian Standard being super-scribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.

[No. CMD/13:9]

का० घा० 3881.—समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) के विनियम 7 के उपविनियम (3) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि एलुमिनो लौहिक की प्रति इकाई मुहर लगाने की फीस जिसके बाद नीचे अनुसूची में दी गई है निर्धारित की गई है और ये फीस 1979-09-16 से लागू होगी :

अनुसूची

म उत्पाद/उत्पाद की श्रेणी सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक की पदसंख्या और शीर्षक	इकाई	प्रति इकाई मुहर लगाने की फीस	
संख्या			
(1) (2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. एलुमिनो-लौहिक	IS : 299—1975 एलुमिनो-लौहिक की विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	एक भीटरी टन	(1) पहली 1000 इकाइयों के लिए रु 3.00 प्रति इकाई, (2) 1001वीं से 6000 इकाइयों तक रु 1.50 प्रति इकाई, (3) 6001वीं और अधिक इकाइयों के लिए 50 पैसे प्रति इकाई

[स० सी एम डी/13 : 10]

S.O. 3881.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (3) of Regulation 7 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that the marking fee per unit for Alumino-ferric details of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has been determined and the fee shall come into force with effect from 1979-09-16 :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Product	No. and Title of Relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking Fee per Unit
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	Alumino-ferric	IS : 299—1975 Specification for alumino-ferric (second revision)	One Tonne	(i) Rs. 3.00 per unit for the first 1000 units; (ii) Rs. 1.50 per unit for the 1001st to 6000 units and (iii) 50 paise per unit for the 6001st unit and above.

[No. CMD/13 : 10]

का० अा० 3882.—भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खण्ड 3 उपखण्ड (ii) दिनांक 1968-10-19 में प्रकाशित तत्कालीन भौद्योगिक विकास संघ कार्य मंत्रालय (भौद्योगिक विकास विभाग) (भारतीय मानक संस्था) अधिसूचना संख्या एस० आ० 3678 दिनांक 1968-09-26 के अधिक्रमण के रूप में भारतीय मानक संस्था की ओर से एवं द्वारा प्रधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विष्ट धारा वेलिंग जनिवों की प्रति इकाई मुहर लगाने की फीस का पुनरीक्षण किया गया है। मुहर लगाने की पुनरीक्षित फीस जिसके बारे इसके बाद अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, 1979-10-01 से लागू होगी:

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	उत्पाद/उत्पाद की श्रेणी	सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक की पदसंख्या और शीर्षक	इकाई	प्रति इकाई मुहर लगाने की फीस
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	विष्टधारा विद्युत वेलिंग जनिव	IS: 2635—1975 दिव्यधारा विद्युत वेलिंग जनिवों की विशिष्ट (द्विसरा पुनरीक्षण)	एक जनिव	रु 25.00

[संख्या सी एम आ०/13 : 10]

S.O. 3882.—In supersession of the then Ministry of Industrial Development and Company Affairs (Department of Industrial Development) (Indian Standards Institution) notification number S.O. 3678 dated 1968-09-26 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, section 3, sub-section(ii) dated 1968-10-19, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that the marking fee per unit for dc electric welding generators has been revised. The revised rate of marking fee, details of which are mentioned in the schedule given hereafter, shall come into force with effect from 1979-10-01 :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Product	No. and Title of Relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking fee per unit
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	dc electric welding generators	IS : 2635—1975 specification for dc electric welding generators (second revision).	One Generator	Rs. 25.00

[No. CMD/13 : 10]

नई विली 1979-11-09

का० अा० 3883—समय समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रभागन चिह्न) के विनियम 14 के उपविनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा प्रधिसूचित किया जाता है कि लाइसेंस संख्या सी एम/एल—7066 जिसके बारे नीचे दिए गए हैं, भा. मा संस्था मुहर में रखी न होने के कारण 16 अक्टूबर 1979 से रद्द कर दिया गया है।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या और तिथि	लाइसेंस धारी का नाम और पता	रद्द किए गए लाइसेंस के आधीन अस्ति/प्रक्रिया	तरसंबंधी भारतीय मानक
1.	सी एम/एल—7066 1978-06-19	मैसर्स उत्कल एंग्रो इंडस्ट्रीज ब्रो टी रोड डाक-घर और जिला बालासोर (उडीमा)	सप्लाई से जल भरने के लिए ग्रल्प घटत्व पोली- इथाइलीन के पाइप पावर रेटिंग	IS : 3076—1968 सप्लाई से जल भरने के लिए ग्रल्प घटत्व पोली- इथाइलीन के पाइपों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)
			2. 5 किंग्रा० व/ से० मी० ²	90 मि० मी० वाल्व व्यास
			6 किंग्रा० व/से० मी० ²	50 मि० मी० वाल्व व्यास
			10 किंग्रा० व/से० मी० ²	25 मि० मी० वाल्व व्यास

[संख्या सी एम आ०/55 : 7066]

New Delhi, the 1979-11-09

S.O. 3883.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations, 1955 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that Licence No. CM/L-7066 particulars of which are given below has been cancelled with effect from 16-4-79 as the licensee is not interested to operate the licence.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Name & Address of the Licensee	Article/Process Covered by the Licensee cancelled	Relevant Indian Standards
1	2	3	4	5
1.	CM/L-7066 1978-06-19	M/s. Utkal Agro Industries, O.T. Road, P.O. & Distt. Balasore (Orissa)	Low density polyethylene pipes for potable water supplies :	IS : 3076—1968 Specification for low density polyethylene pipes for pot- able water supplies (First revision).
			Pressure Rating	Nominal Size
			2.5 kgf/cm ²	90 mm O.D.
			6 kgf/cm ²	50 mm O.D.
			10 kgf/cm ²	25 mm O.D.

[No. CMD/55 : 7066]

राहि विली, 1979-11-12

का० ३८८४—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन विभ.) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 14 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था की ओर से एतद्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि लाइसेंस संख्या सी० एम०/एल०—५४२७ जिसके ब्यौरे भीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, लाइसेंसधारी की लाइसेंस चलाने में रुचि न होने के कारण 1978-08-01 से रद्द कर दिया गया है।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	रद्द किए गए लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु/प्रक्रिया	सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक	
1	2	3	4	5
1. सी० एम०/एल०—५४२७ 1976-08-11	मैसर्स काउन टिम्बर एण्ड फारेस्ट्स प्रा० लि०, सहारनपुर रोड, यमुना नगर, जिला अमृतसर	चाय की प्लाइवुड की पेटियों की पट्टियाँ	IS : 10 (भाग 3)—1974 प्लाइवुड की चाय की पेटियों की विशिष्ट भाग 3 पट्टियाँ (चौथा पुनरीक्षण)	

[सं० सी० एम०/55 : ५४२७]

New Delhi, the 1979-11-12

S.O. 3884.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations, 1955 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that Licence No. CM/L-5427 particulars of which are given below has/have been cancelled with effect from 1979-08-01 as the licensee is not interested to operate the licence.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Name and Address of the Licensee	Article/Process covered by the Licensee cancelled	Relevant Indian Standards
1	2	3	4	5
1.	CM/L-5427 1976-08-11	M/s. Crown Timber & Forests Pvt. Ltd., Saharanpur Road, Yamuna Nagar, Distt. Ambala.	Plywood teachest battens	IS : 10 (Part III)-1974 Specification for plywood teachests : Part III Battens (fourth revision).

[No. CMD/55 : 5427]

का० ३८८५—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन विभ.) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 14 के उपविनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था की ओर से एतद्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि लाइसेंस संख्या सी० एम०/एल०—४२७८ जिसके ब्यौरे भीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं लाइसेंसधारी द्वारा संतोषजनकपूर्वक न चला सकने के कारण 1979-08-09 से रद्द कर दिया गया है।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या और तिथि	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	रद्द किए गए लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु/प्रक्रिया	सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक
1	2	3	4	5
1.	सी० एम०/एल०—४२७८ 1975-03-26	मैसर्स एस० बी० एस० कारपो- रेशन 24-बी पंचाननदेश सेन, मार्क्सः एस० बी० एस० बी० कलकत्ता-12	चाय के पेटियों के धातु किटिंग	IS : 10 (भाग 4)—1976 चाय की प्लाइ- वुड बी पेटियों की विशिष्ट भाग 4 धातु किटिंग (चौथा पुनरीक्षण)।

[सं० सी० एम०/55 : ४२७८]

S. O. 3885.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations, 1955 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that Licence No. CM/L-4278 particulars of which are given below has/have been cancelled with effect from 1979-08-09 as the licensee has not been able to operate the licence satisfactorily.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and date No.	Name & Address of the Licensee	Article/Process Covered by the Licensee cancelled	Relevant Indian Standards
1	2	3	4	5
1.	CM/L-4278 1975-03-26	M/s. S. D. S. Corporation, 24B, Panchanatala Lane, Calcutta-12.	Teachest metal fittings Brand: 'SDSC'	IS : 10 (Part IV)-1976 Specification for plywood teachests : Part IV Metal fittings (fourth revision)

[No. CMD/55 : 4278]

नई दिल्ली, 1979-11-16

का० आ० 3886.—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) विनियम 14 के उपविनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था भी और से प्रधिसूचित किया जाता है कि लाइसेंस संस्था सी एम/एल—4542, जिसके अंतर्गत नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, लाइसेंसधारी की इच्छानुसार पहली सितम्बर उक्सी सौ उन्नासी से रद्द कर दिया गया है।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	लाइसेंस संस्था और शिक्षक	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	रद्द किए गए लाइसेंस के प्रधीन वस्तु/ प्रक्रिया	सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक
1	2	3	4	5
1.	सी एम/एल—4542 1975-08-11	मैसेस रेलिस इंडिया लिं. (उद्योग एवं कीटनाशक विभाग) टाटा फाइशन पेस्टिसाइस कार्मुके- टिंग मूर्निट, 431/34 बलराजेश्वर रोड, मुंबई-400080	एल्ड्रिन घूलन पाउडर—मार्क: एल्ड्रिन IS : 1308—1974 एल्ड्रिन घूलन पाउडर 5-प्रतिशत और टिंग मूर्निट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	

[सं० सी एम ई/55 : 4542]
ए०पी० बनर्जी, उप-महानिवेशक

New Delhi, the 1979-11-16.

S.O. 3886.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations, 1955 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that Licence No. CM/L-4542 particulars of which are given in the Schedule below has been cancelled with effect from First September, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy nine at the request of the licensee.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date No.	Name and Address of the Licensee	Article/Process Covered by the Licensee cancelled	Relevant Indian Standard
1	2	3	4	5
1.	CM/L-4542 1975-08-11	M/s. Rallis India Ltd., (Fertilizers & Pesticides Division), Tata Fison Pesticides Formulating Unit, 431/34 Balrajeswar Road, Muland, Bombay-400080.	Aldrin DP Brand : Aldrin 5%D	IS : 1308-1974 Specification for Aldrin Dusting Powders (First Revision).

[No. CMD/55 : 4542]

A.P. BANERJI, Dy. Director General

नई दिल्ली, 19 नवम्बर, 1979

क्रा० आ० 3890.—केन्द्रीय सरकार राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोगों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को, जिनके कर्मचारी बृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक भान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है—

परिवार कल्याण विभाग के अधीनस्थ कार्यालय :—

1. क्षेत्रीय स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण कार्यालय, भोपाल
2. क्षेत्रीय स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण कार्यालय, पटना
3. क्षेत्रीय स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण कार्यालय, गिरामा
4. क्षेत्रीय स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण कार्यालय, चंडीगढ़ स्वास्थ्य सेवा भानिवेशालय के अधीनस्थ कार्यालय :—
5. केन्द्रीय सरकार स्वास्थ्य योजना, जयपुर
6. केन्द्रीय सरकार स्वास्थ्य योजना, कानपुर
7. राष्ट्रीय संचारी रोग संस्थान, दिल्ली
8. विमान पत्तन स्वास्थ्य संगठन, दिल्ली
9. विमान पत्तन स्वास्थ्य संगठन, बम्बई

[सं०६० 11012/4/79-रा०आ० कार्या०]
प्रानन्द प्रकाश अर्दी, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 19th November, 1979

S.O. 3890.—In pursuance of sub-rule 4 of rule 10 of the Official Language (use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices, the staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi :—

Subordinate Offices under Department of Family Welfare :—

1. Regional Office for Health & Family Welfare, Bhopal.
2. Regional Office for Health & Family Welfare, Patna.
3. Regional Office for Health & Family Welfare, Simla.
4. Regional Office for Health & Family Welfare, Chandigarh.

Subordinate Offices under Directorate General of Health Services :—

5. Central Government Health Scheme, Jaipur.
6. Central Government Health Scheme, Kanpur.
7. National Institute of Communicable Diseases, Delhi.
8. Airport Health Organisation, Delhi.
9. Airport Health Organisation, Bombay.

[No. E. 11012/4/79-O.L. Implementation]
A. P. ATRI, Director

इस्पात, खान और कोयला मंत्रालय

(इस्पात विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 14 नवम्बर, 1979

क्रा० आ० 3191.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोगों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम 4 के अनुसरण में हिन्दुस्तान स्टील बर्स कन्स्ट्रक्शन लि० की निम्नलिखित इकाइयों की, जिनके कर्मचारी बृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक भान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है—

1. हिन्दुस्तान स्टीलबर्स कन्स्ट्रक्शन लि०, बोकारो इकाई
2. हिन्दुस्तान स्टीलबर्स कन्स्ट्रक्शन लि०, पटना इकाई
3. हिन्दुस्तान स्टीलबर्स कन्स्ट्रक्शन लि०, बंगलौर इकाई
4. हिन्दुस्तान स्टीलबर्स कन्स्ट्रक्शन लि०, कोरबा इकाई
5. हिन्दुस्तान स्टीलबर्स कन्स्ट्रक्शन लि०, दिल्ली इकाई
6. हिन्दुस्तान स्टीलबर्स कन्स्ट्रक्शन लि०, बम्बई इकाई

[संख्या E-11011/10/78-हिन्दी]

एम०एम० हुसैन, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF STEEL, MINES & COAL

(Department of Steel)

New Delhi, the 14th November, 1979

S.O. 3891.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby notifies the following units of Hindustan Steelworks Construction Ltd., the staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi:—

1. Hindustan Steelworks Construction Ltd., Bokaro Unit.
2. Hindustan Steelworks Construction Ltd., Patna Unit.
3. Hindustan Steelworks Construction Ltd., Bangalore Unit.
4. Hindustan Steelworks Construction Ltd., Korba Unit.
5. Hindustan Steelworks Construction Ltd., Delhi Unit.
6. Hindustan Steelworks Construction Ltd., Bombay Unit.

[No. E-11011/10/78-Hindi]

M. M. HUSSAIN, Under Secy.

खाद्य और सिंचाई मंत्रालय

(खाद्य विभाग)

आवेदन

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 1979

क्रा० आ० 3892.—अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने खाद्य विभाग, खेत्रीय खाद्य निवेशालयों, उपाप्ति निवेशालयों और खाद्य विभाग के वेतन तथा लेखा कार्यालयों द्वारा किए जाने वाले खाद्यालयों के फ्रप, भज्जारकरण, संचलन, परिवहन, वितरण तथा वित्रय के क्रूर्तयों का पालन करना ध्वनि कर दिया है जोकि खाद्य नियम 1964 (1964 का 37) की धारा 13 के अधीन भारतीय खाद्य नियम के क्रूर्त है;

और यह खाद्य विभाग, खेत्रीय खाद्य निवेशालयों, उपाप्ति निवेशालयों और खाद्य विभाग के वेतन तथा लेखा कार्यालयों में कार्य कर रहे और उपरिवर्णित क्रूर्तों के पालन में लगे निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों और कर्मचारियों ने केन्द्रीय सरकार के तारीख 16 अप्रैल, 1971 के परिपक्व के प्रत्युत्तर में उसमें विनियिष्ट तारीख के अन्वर भारतीय खाद्य नियम के कर्मचारी न बनने के प्रपत्रे आशय को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12ए की उपधारा (1) के परन्तु द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित भूत्ता नहीं दी है।

अतः अब खाद्य निगम अधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 37) यथा भवातन संशोधित की धारा 12 ए द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एवं द्वारा निम्नलिखित कर्मचारियों को प्रत्येक के सामने दी गई तारीख से भारतीय खाद्य निगम में स्थानान्तरित करती है।—

कम अधिकारी/कर्मचारियों का नाम सं.	केन्द्रीय सरकार के द्वारा दी गई तारीख से स्थानान्तरण के समय केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधीन पद	भारतीय खाद्य निगम को स्थानान्तरण की तारीख
-----------------------------------	--	---

सर्वश्री

1. दया चन्द	—	गोदाम लिपिक	1-3-69
2. जे० एन० मलिक	गोदाम लिपिक	फनिष्ठ गोदाम रक्षक	1-3-69
3. फूल सिंह	—	गोदाम लिपिक	1-3-69
4. जीत सिंह	सहायक निदेशक (जनरल)	उप निदेशक (जनरल)	1-3-69

[संख्या 52/1/79-एफ.सी.आई. (वाल्यूम-4)]

बरशी राम, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE & IRRIGATION

(Department of Food)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th November, 1979

S. O. 3892.—Whereas the Central Government has ceased to perform the functions of purchase, storage, movement, transport distribution and sale of foodgrains done by the Department of Food, the Regional Directorates of Food, the Procurement Directors and the Pay & Accounts Offices of the Deptt. of Food which under section 13 of Food Corporations Act, 1964 (37 of 1964) are the functions of the Food Corporation of India ;

And whereas the following officers and employees serving in the Department of Food, the Regional Directorate of Food, the Procurement Directorates and the Pay & Accounts Offices of the Department of Food and engaged in the performance of the functions mentioned above have not, in response to the Circular of the Central Government dated the 16th April, 1971 intimated, within the date specified therein, their intention of not becoming employees of the Food Corporation of India as required by the proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 12A of the said Act;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 12A of the Food Corporations Act, 1964 (37 of 1964) as amended upto date the Central Government hereby transfer the following officers and employees to the Food Corporation of India with effect from the date mentioned against each of them.

Sl. No.	Name of the officer/employees Permanent post hold under the Central Government	Post held under the Central Government at the time of transfer	Date of transfer to the F.C.I.
S/Shri			
1. Daya Chand	Godown Clerk	Godown Clerk	1-3-69
2. J.N. Malik	—	Jr. Godown Keeper	1-3-69
3. Phool Singh	—	Godown Clerk	1-3-69
4. Jit Singh	Assistant Director (G)	Dy. Director (Genl.)	1-3-69

[No. 52/1/79-FC. III (Vol. IV)]
BAKSHI RAM, Dy. Secy.

नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय

(नौवहन महानिवेशालय)

प्रावेश

बम्बई, 14 नवम्बर, 1979

(आणिंज्य नौवहन)

कांग्रेस 3893.—आणिंज्य पोत परिवहन अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 44) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और अधिकृतता सं. कांग्रेस 2321, दिनांक 7 जून, 1967 को अधिकृत करते हुए नौवहन महानिवेशक, केन्द्रीय सरकार के पूर्व-मुमोजन से एवं द्वारा निदेश देते हैं कि निम्नान्वित सारणी के स्तरम् (1) में विविध उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्धों के द्वारा या अधीन

जो उन्हें प्राधिकार की शक्ति प्रदत्त की है या उनका प्रथायोजन किया है या उन पर कर्तव्य का अधिरोपण किया है, उसका प्रयोग या निर्वहन जैसा भी मामला हो, उक्त सारणी के स्तरम् (2) में विविध अधिकारियों द्वारा, उस सारणी के स्तरम् (3) में उसके स्तरम् (2) की प्रविधि के सामने विविध शर्तों के अध्यात्म किया जाएगा, अर्थात्—

सारणी

वाणिज्य पोत परिवहन अधिनियम 1958 (1958 का 44)	अधिकारी	शर्तें
1	2	3
41	वरिष्ठ उप महानिवेशक	(1) शक्ति केवल तभी प्रयोग होती जब महानिवेशक
79(2)	महानिवेशक	

1	2	3
121		के पद के पदाधिकारी
145(2)		आस्थान में उपलब्ध न हों
157(1)		
158		(2) किसी भारतीय पाल जल-
161(7)		यान के हस्तान्तरण को
165		पूर्ववर्ती अनुमोदन देने की
176		शक्ति प्रयोक्तव्य नहीं होगी
191(2)		जिन मामलों में हस्तान्तरी
197		भारत का नागरिक न हो
206		या कोई कम्पनी उक्त
210		प्रधिनियम की धारा 21
316(2)		के खण्ड (ख) की आवश्यक-
366(3)		ताओं का समाधान न
388		करती हो;
406	उप महानिदेशक	(1) शक्ति तभी प्रयोक्तव्य
407		होगी जब दोनों, महानिदेशक के पद के पदाधिकारी
408		या वरिष्ठ उप महानिदेशक के पद के पदाधिकारी, भी
411		आस्थान में उपलब्ध न हो;
426		(2) किसी भारतीय पाल जल-
431		यान के हस्तान्तरण को
456(1)		पूर्ववर्ती अनुमोदन देने की
		शक्ति प्रयोक्तव्य नहीं
		होगी जिन मामलों में
		हस्तान्तरी भारत का नागरिक न हो या कोई कम्पनी
		उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा
		21 के खण्ड (ख) की
		आवश्यकताओं का समाधान न करती हो।

[फाइल सं. 3-एस एल(1)/78]

राजदूत प्रधान, नौवक्तुन महानिदेशक

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING & TRANSPORT

(Directorate General of Shipping)

ORDER

Bombay, the 14th November, 1979

(MERCHANT SHIPPING)

S.O. 3893.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 7 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958) and in supersession of notification No. S.O. 2321 dated the 7th June, 1967 the Director General, with the previous approval of the Central Government, hereby directs that the power or authority conferred in or delegated to or duty imposed upon him by or under the provisions of the said Act specified in column (1) of the Table set out here below shall be exercised or, as the case may be, discharged by officers specified in column (2) of the said Table subject

to conditions specified in column (3) of that Table against the entry in column (2) thereof, namely :—

TABLE

Provisions of the Officers Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958)	Conditions	
1	2	3
41	Sr. Deputy	(1) Power shall be exercisable only when the incumbent of the post of Director General is not available in station.
79(2)	Director	(2) The power to give prior approval to the transfer of any Indian sailing vessel shall not be exercisable in cases where the transferee is not a citizen of India or a company satisfying the requirements of clause (b) of section 21 of the said Act.
121	General	
145(2)		
157(1)		
158		
161(7)		
165		
176		
191(2)		
197		
206		
210		
316(2)	Deputy	(1) Powers shall be exercisable when neither the incumbent of the post of Director General nor that of the post of Senior Deputy Director General is available in station.
366(3)	Directors	(2) The power to give prior approval to the transfer of any Indian sailing vessel shall not be exercisable in cases where the transferee is not a citizen of India or a company satisfying the requirements of clause (b) of section 21 of the said Act.
388	General	
406		
407		
408		
411		
426		
431		
456(1)		

[F. No. 3-SL(1)/78]
R. D. PRADHAN, Director General of
Shipping

निम्नांकित और आवास मंत्रालय

मई दिल्ली, 10 अक्टूबर, 1979

का०प्रा० 3894.—यह कालिपथ संशोधन जिन्हें केन्द्रीय सरकार निम्नलिखित धेरों के बारे में विली की बृहत योजना में प्रस्थापना करती है, विली विकास प्रधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 61) की धारा 44 के उपबन्धों के अनुसार विली विकास प्राधिकरण द्वारा दिनांक 21 अप्रैल, 1979 के मोटिम संघर्ष एफ० 20(4)/79-एम०पी०, के साथ प्रकाशित की गई थी, जिसमें उक्त नोटिस की तारीख के 30 दिन के प्रत्यक्ष उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 11-ए० को उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रतिक्रिया की गयी थी;

और यह: उक्त संशोधनों के बारे में कोई प्राप्ति या सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने दिली की बृहत योजना और जोनल विकास प्लान में मंशोधन करने का निर्णय लिया है ;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 11(क) की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, विली की बृहत

योजना तथा क्षेत्रीय विकास योजना में भारत के राजपत्र में इस अधिनियम के प्रकाशन की तारीख से निम्नलिखित उपालंतरण करती है, प्रधानमंत्री द्वारा:

डिफेंस कालोनी प्लाई ग्रोवर के नीचे स्थित क्षेत्र संघ, डी-17, 18, 19, 20 एवं 21 व 3 के मिश्रित क्षेत्रीय विकास चिह्न में आने वाले डिफेंस कालोनी के सामने के लगभग 1.92 हेक्टेयर (4.75 एकड़) क्षेत्रफल के उस भूखण्ड जिसके परिचम में सार्वजनिक एवं अर्धसार्वजनिक मुद्रितों का क्षेत्र पूर्व में लाजपत नगर तथा जंगपुरा एक्सटेंशन है, के भूमि उपयोग को "परिवर्तन से" "व्यवसायिक" (स्थानीय विपणन केन्द्र) में परिवर्तित किये जाने का प्रस्ताव है।

[मं. ० के-० १३०११/२१/७८-डी०डी००४०/IIए०]

MINISTRY OF WORKS & HOUSING

New Delhi, the 10th October, 1979

S.O. 3894.—Whereas certain modifications, which the Central Government proposes to make in the Master Plan for Delhi regarding the areas mentioned hereunder, was published by the Delhi Development Authority with Notice No. F. 20 (4)/79-MP, dated the 21st April, 1979 in accordance with the provisions of section 44 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957 (61 of 1957) inviting objections/suggestions as required by sub-section (3) of section 11-A of the said Act, within thirty days from the date of the said notice;

And whereas no objection or suggestion has been received with regard to the aforesaid modifications, the Central Government have decided to modify that Master Plan for Delhi and Zonal Development Plan;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 11-A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following modification in the said Master Plan for Delhi with effect from the date of publication of this notification in the Gazette of India, namely:—

Modification

The land use of an area measuring about 1.92 hectares (4.75 acres) located under the Defence Colony Flyover facing Defence Colony and falling in the composite Zonal Development Plan of Zone D-17, 18, 19, 20, F-2 and 3, and Public and Semi Public Facility Area towards west, Lajpat Nagar and Jangpura Extension towards East, and earmarked for 'Circulation' in the Master Plan is changed to 'Commercial' (Local Shopping Centre).

[No. K-13011/21/78-DDIA/IIA]

नई दिल्ली, 17 नवम्बर, 1979

का०डा० 3895.—यह कठिन भौतिक जिन्हें केन्द्रीय सरकार एवं दीर्घ स्वेच्छाओं के बारे में दिल्ली की बहुत योजना में करते का प्रस्ताव करती है, दिल्ली विकास अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 61) की धारा 44 के उपबच्चों के अनुसार दिनांक 28-4-1979 के नोटिस संख्या एफ० ३(५)/७५-एम०पी० के साथ प्रकाशित की गई थी जिसमें उक्त नोटिस की तारीख के 30 दिन के पश्चात उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11-क की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रभासित प्राप्तियाँ (मासाव मार्गे गये थे)।

और यह: उक्त संप्रयोगों के बारे में कोई प्राप्ति या सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है।

प्रत: अब केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11-क की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त प्रक्रियों का प्रयोग करते हुए दिल्ली की बहुत योजना में भारत के राजपत्र में इस अधिनियम के प्रकाशन की तारीख से निम्नलिखित उपालंतरण करती है प्रधानमंत्री:—

संशोधन

बहुत योजना में कृषि हरो पट्टी के लिये वित्तिय जीत सं. एफ० १९ का भूमि का लगभग 30.35 हेक्टेयर (75 एकड़) औ उत्तर में 170 मीटर लम्बे बदापुर घरमल स्टेशन की रेलवे साइरिंग से घिरा

हुआ, पूर्व-पौर्वकम में घरमल पत्तर स्टेशन की सीमा दोबार और दक्षिण-पश्चिम में मधुरा रोड मुख्य मार्ग से घिरे हुए क्षेत्र के भूमि उपयोग को बदलकर "व्यवसायिक" करते का प्रस्ताव है।

[संख्या के-० १३०११(२४)/७८-डी०डी०-ए०]

एस. बालाकृष्णन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th November, 1979

S.O. 3895.—Whereas certain modifications, which the Central Government proposes to make in the Master Plan for Delhi regarding the areas mentioned hereunder, were published with Notice No. F. 3/5/75-MP, dated 28-4-1979, in accordance with the provisions of section 44 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957 (61 of 1957) inviting objections/suggestions, as required by sub-section (3) of section 11-A of the said Act, within thirty days from the date of said Notice;

And whereas no objection or suggestion has been received with regard to the aforesaid modifications;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 11-A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following modifications in the said Master Plan for Delhi with effect from the date of publication of this modification in the Gazette of India, namely:—

Modifications

The land use of an area measuring about 30-35 hectares (75 acres) of land falling in Zone F-19 earmarked for 'Agriculture Green Belt' in the Master Plan and surrounded by 170 mtrs. Railway siding to Badarpur Thermal Station in the North, boundary wall of Thermal Power Station on the East-West and main Mathura Road on South-West, is proposed to be changed to 'Residential'.

[No. K-13011/24/78-DD II-A]

S. BALAKRISHNAN, Desk Officer

मुद्रण निवेशालय

नई दिल्ली, 13 नवम्बर, 1979

का०डा० 3896.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, रजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के प्रयोग के लिये) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसार में, निम्नलिखित भारत सरकार मुद्रणालयों को, जिनके कर्मचारियों ने हिती का कर्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है:—

1. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, शिमला।
2. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, नारिक।
3. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, रिंग रोड, नई दिल्ली।
4. भारत सरकार मुद्रणालय, फरीदाबाद।
5. भारत सरकार फोटो-प्रिंटो मुद्रणालय, फरीदाबाद।
6. भारत सरकार वेटेंट प्रिंटिंग मुद्रणालय, बम्बई।

[मं. ई०-११०१७/२९/७७ हिन्दी]

प्रभाकर कुलकर्णी, संयुक्त निवेशक, (प्रणासन)

DIRECTORATE OF PRINTING

New Delhi, the 13th November, 1979

S.O. 3896.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following Government of India Presses, the staff whereof have acquired a working knowledge of Hindi:—

1. Govt. of India Press, Simla.
2. Govt. of India Press, Nasik.
3. Govt. of India Press, Ring Road, New Delhi.
4. Govt. of India Press, Faridabad.
5. Govt. of India Photolitho Press, Faridabad.
6. Govt. of India Patent Printing Press, Bombay.

[No. E-11017/29/77-Hindi]

P. B. KULKARNI, Jt. Director (Admn.)

पर्यटन और नामर विभाग संचालन

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 30 अक्टूबर, 1979

का० आ० 3897.—केंद्रीय विभिन्न सेवाएं (वर्गीकरण, नियक्षण और अधीन) नियम, 1965 के नियम 9 के उप-नियम (2), नियम 12 के उप-नियम (2) के खंड (व) और नियम 24 के उप-नियम (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त वाक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इस मंत्रालय के प्राधिक संस्था सी-11012/2/73-प्रशासन-1 दिनांक 17-8-1974 में आधिक संरचना करते हुए, राष्ट्रपति एन्ड्रद्वारा यह नियम वेसे हैं कि कथित आदेश की अनुसूची के भाग ii और भाग iii में “परियोजना प्रशासक और पर्यटन के पर्वत उप महानिदेशक” शब्द जहाँ कही भी आएं, वहाँ “निदेशक” शब्द प्रतिस्थापित किया जाएगा।

[सं० सी-11012(2)/79-प्रशासन-1 (पर्यटन)]

बानू राम अग्रवाल, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION

ORDER

New Delhi, the 30th October, 1979

S.O. 3897.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12 and sub-rule (1) of rule 24 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965 and in partial modification of this Ministry's Order No. C-11012/2/73-Admn. I dated 17th August, 1974 the President hereby directs that in Part II and Part III of the Schedule to the said Order, for the words, “Project Administrator and ex officio Deputy Director General of Tourism” wherever they occur, the word “Director” shall be substituted.

[No. C-11012(2)/79-Admn. I (Tourism)]

BANU RAM AGGARWAL, Dy. Secy.

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 13 नवम्बर, 1979

का० आ० 3898.—भारत सरकार के सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय के आदेश संस्था एम० आ० 3792, विनांक 2 दिसम्बर, 1966 की प्रथम अनुसूची में निर्धारित प्रत्येक अधिनियम के उपबन्ध के प्रत्यार्थी जारी किए गए नियमों के अनुभाव, केंद्रीय सरकार, फ़िल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड, बम्बई की मिफारियों पर विचार करने के बाद एन्ड्रद्वारा इसके साथ लगी अनुसूची के कालम 2 में ऐसी गई नियमों को उनके सभी भारतीय भाषाओं के लियाँतरों महित, जिनका विवरण प्रत्येक के सामने उक्त अनुसूची के कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है, स्वीकृत करती है।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	फ़िल्म का नाम	फ़िल्म की संख्या (मीटरों में)	आदेशक का नाम	नियमांक का नाम	व्या वैशानिक फ़िल्म है या या या संबंधी फ़िल्म है या समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फ़िल्म है या आकुमेट्री फ़िल्म है।
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. महाराष्ट्र समाचार संस्था 337	237.00	सूचना और जन सम्पर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, फ़िल्म सेटर, 68 सारदेव रोड, बम्बई-400034			“सामाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं” की फ़िल्म (महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए)
2. अनंतन वि बोर्ड	274.62	एन०वी० पिक्चर, 5-न्यूनिटी कम्प्यूनिट	जूह रोड, बम्बई-49		“डाकुमेट्री” फ़िल्म (सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए)
3. अफ़सूस	352.04	सिने जोन, प्रशरफ़ टूडियोज महिम	रेलवे स्टेशन के सामने, बम्बई-1	आफ़सर एकीन मिर्जा, “डाकुमेट्री” फ़िल्म (ग्रामीण धोकों में प्रशरफ़ टूडियोज महिम प्रदर्शन के लिए)	
4. प्रगति के पथ पर विहार भाग-13	243.84	एम० जा, विहार मरकार		सूचना और जनभिप्रकृति नियंत्रक, “डाकुमेट्री” फ़िल्म (विहार मरकार, पटना, पटना)	नमाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फ़िल्म (विहार सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए)
5. हमारे कर	298.00	सूचना और जन सम्पर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, फ़िल्म सेटर, 68-नारदेव रोड, बम्बई-100034			“डाकुमेट्री” फ़िल्म (सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए)
6. भारतीय समाचार जिल संस्था 1617-ए	210.00	फ़िल्म प्रभाग, भारत मरकार, 24 पैड्ग रोड, बम्बई-26			“समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं” की फ़िल्म (सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए)
7. काले सोने की सलाह	331.00		-नदेव-		“डाकुमेट्री” फ़िल्म (सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए)
8. प्रगति के पथ पर विहार-भाग-14	285.29	श्रो एम० जा विहार मरकार, सूचना और जन सम्पर्क विभाग, विहार मरकार, पटना			“समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं” की फ़िल्म (विहार मरकार में प्रदर्शन के लिए)

1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	कमलादेवी चट्टोपाध्याय	527.30	श्री बी० डी० गर्ग, डी-११ कामर्स सेंटर, तारेव रोड, बम्बई-३४		"झाकुमेट्री" फिल्म (सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए)
10.	प्रभिशाप	375.76	मीनाक्षी फिल्म प्रोडक्शंस ३६-एन० एस० मार्ग, दिल्लीगंज, नई दिल्ली-२	कुंवर प्रनिल कुमार ३६-एन०एस० मार्ग, दिल्लीगंज, नई दिल्ली-२	"झाकुमेट्री" फिल्म (सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए)
11.	भारतीय समाचार चित्र संचया 1618 (राष्ट्रीय)	197.00	फिल्म प्रभाग भारत सरकार, २४ पैडर रोड, बम्बई-२६		"समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की" फिल्म (सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए)
12.	भारतीय समाचार चित्र संचया 1619 (पर्यावरणी)	304.00	—तदैव-		"समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की" फिल्म (पर्यावरणी संकिट में प्रदर्शन के लिए)
13.	हवा से बातें	418.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, ४-टालस्टाय मार्ग, नई दिल्ली	फिल्म प्रभाग २४, पैडर रोड, बम्बई-२६	"झाकुमेट्री" फिल्म (सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए)
14.	माहिती चित्र संचया ३१०	266.73	सूचना सहायक निदेशक, गुजरात सर- कार, धनराज महल, छतपति शिवाजी महाराज मार्ग, बम्बई-३९		"समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की" फिल्म (गुजरात संकिट में प्रदर्शन के लिए)
15.	भूमि संरक्षण	243.84	श्री एम० झा० सूचना और जनसम्पर्क निदेशक, विहार सरकार, पटना		"झाकुमेट्री" फिल्म (विहार संकिट में प्रदर्शन के लिए)
16.	भारतीय समाचार चित्र संचया 1619 (राष्ट्रीय)	224.33	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार २४ पैडर रोड, बम्बई-२६		"समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की" फिल्म (सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए)
17.	भारतीय समाचार चित्र संचया 1619 (उत्तरी)	295.35	—तदैव-		"समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की" फिल्म (उत्तरी संकिट में प्रदर्शन के लिए)
18.	कंचनजगा पर विजय	561.00	—तदैव-		"झाकुमेट्री" फिल्म (सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए)
19.	माहिती चित्र संचया ३११	289.56	सूचना सहायक निदेशक, गुजरात सर- कार, धनराज महल, छतपति शिवा- जी मार्ग, बम्बई-३९	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार	"समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की" फिल्म (गुजरात संकिट में प्रदर्शन के लिए)
20.	पंकज मलिक	486.56	भगवा कुमार कलात्मक, ग्रोल्ड म्यूचुअल बिल्डिंग, तीसरा तल, २३ हमाम स्ट्रीटफोर्ट, बम्बई		"झाकुमेट्री" फिल्म (सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए)

[फाइल संख्या ३१५/१/७८-एफ (पी)]
प्रार्जन देव मलिक, ईस्क प्रधिकारी

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING
ORDER

New Delhi, the 13th November, 1979

S. O. 3898.—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provision of each of the enactments specified in the First Schedule to the order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.O. 3792 dated the 2nd December, 1966, the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Schedule annexed hereto in all its/their language versions to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said Schedule.

SCHEDULE

S. No.	Title of the Film	Length of the film (in meters)	Name of the applicant	Name of the Producer	Brief whether a synopsis scientific film or for educational purpose or a film dealing with news currents events or documentary film
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Maharashtra News No. 337 .	237.00	Directorate General of Inf. & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68-Tardeo Road, Bombay-400034.	"News and Current Events" (Release in Maharashtra Circuit).	
2.	Unchain the Woman . . .	274.62	N.B. Picture, 5-Unity Compound, Juhu Road, Bombay-49.	"Documentary" (General release)	
3.	Afsoos	352.04	Cinezone, Ashraf Stu- dios, Opp. Mahim Rly Station, Bombay.	Afsar, Shakil Mirza, Ashraf Studios Opp. Mahim Rly. Station, Bombay-16.	"Documentary" (Release in rural areas).

1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Pragati Ke Path Par Bihar Part 13.	243.84	M. Jha, Govt. of Bihar	Director of Inf. and Public Relations, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.	'News and Current Events, (Release in Bihar circuit).	
5. Our Fruits	288.00	Directorate General of Inf. and Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68-Tardeo Road, Bombay-400034.		'Documentary' (General Release).	
6. Indian News Review No. 1617A.	210.00	Films Division, Govt. of India 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'News and current Events. (General Release).	
7. Search for Black Gold	331.00	-do-		'Documentary' General Release.	
8. Pragati Ke Path Par Bihar Part 14.	285.29	Shri M. Jha, Govt. of Bihar Inf. & Public Relations Dept. Govt. of Bihar, Patna.		'News and current Events' (Release in Bihar circuit).	
9. Kamladevi Chattopadhyay	527.30	Shri B.D. Garga, D-11, Commerce Centre, Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.		'Documentary' (General release).	
10. Abhishek	375.76	Meenakshi Film Prods., Kuwar Anil Kumar, 36-36-N.S. Marg, Darya Ganj, New Delhi-2.	N.S. Marg, Darya Ganj, New Delhi.	'Documentary' (General release).	
11. Indian News Review No. 1618 (National)	197.00	Films Division, Govt. of India, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'News and current Events, (General Release).	
12. Indian News Review No. 1618 (Western)	304.00	-do-		'News and current Events' (Release in Western circuit).	
13. A Word with the Wind	418.00	Films Division 4-Tolstoy Marg, New Delhi.	Films Division 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	'Documentary' General Release.	
14. Mahitichitra No. 310	266.73	Asstt. Director of Information Govt. of Gujarat, Dhanraj Mahal Chh. Shivaji Marg, Bombay-39.		'News and current Events' (Release in Gujarat circuit).	
15. Bhumi Sanrakshan	243.84	Shri M. Jha, Director of Inf. & Public Relations, Govt. of Bihar Patna.		'Documentary' (Release in Bihar circuit).	
16. Indian News Review No. 1619 (National)	224.33	Films Division, Govt. of India, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'News and current Events' (General release).	
17. Indian News Review No. 1619 (Northern)	295.35	-do-		'News and current Events' (Release in Northern circuit).	
18. Conquest of Kanchenjunga	561.00	-do-		'Documentary' (General release).	
19. Mahitichitra No. 311	289.56	Asstt. Director of Information Govt. of Gujarat, Dhanraj Mahal, Chh. Shivaji Marg, Bombay-39.	Director of Information Govt. of Gujarat.	'News and current Events' (Release in Gujarat circuit).	
20. Pankaj Mullick	486.00	Bhadresh Kumar, Kalatmak, Old Mutual Building, Third Floor, 23-Hamam Street, Fort, Bombay-23.		'Documentary' (General release).	

[File No. 315/1/78-F(P)]
A.D. MALIK, Desk Officer

पूर्ति और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय

(पुनर्वास विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 12 नवम्बर, 1979

क्रा० प्रा० 3899.—निष्कात सम्पत्ति प्रशासन अधिनियम 1950 (1950 का 31) की द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा राजस्थान सरकार के पुनर्वास विभाग के प्राध्यक्ष व सचिव श्री जै० एस० मेहता को राजस्थान राज्य में निष्कात सम्पत्तियों के संबंध में उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा या उसके अधीन उप-महाप्रभिरक्षक को सौंपे गये कामों को नियंत्रित करने के लिये उपमहाप्रभिरक्षक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

2. इससे दिनांक 27-5-78 की अधिसूचना स० 1(30)/विशेष सैल/7-एस०-एस०-II का अतिक्रमण किया जाता है।

[स० 1(30)/विशेष सैल/7-एस०-एस०-II]
एन० एम० वास्तवानी, प्रवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Rehabilitation)

New Delhi, the 12th November, 1979

S.O. 3899.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5 of the Administration of Evacuee Property Act, 1950 (31 of 1950), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri J. S. Mehta, Commissioner-cum-Secretary, Rehabilitation Department, Government of Rajasthan as Deputy Custodian General of Evacuee Property for the purpose of discharging the duties imposed on such Deputy Custodian General by or under the said Act in respect of evacuee properties in the Rajasthan State.

2. This supersedes notification No. 1 (30)/Spl. Cell/75-SS. II dated 27-5-78.

[No. 1(30)/Spl. Cell/75-SS.II.]

N. M. WADWANI, Under Secy.

कांगड़ा ३९००.—निष्कात सम्पत्ति प्रश्न, सन अधिनियम, १९५० (१९५० का ३१) की धारा ५५ की उपधारा (३) द्वारा मुख्य महाभिरक्षक के रूप में प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं इसके द्वारा इस विभाग की दिनांक १२-११-७९ की अधिसूचना संख्या १(३०)/वि०से/७५ एस०एम०२ द्वारा आन्ध्राप्रदेश राज्य के लिये नियुक्त उपमहाभिरक्षक श्री जे० ए० ए० मेहता को महा भ्रभिरक्षक की निम्नलिखित शक्तियाँ सौंपता हूँ—

(1) अधिनियम की धारा 24 और 27 के अन्तर्गत प्राप्त वासी शक्तियाँ।

(2) प्रधिमियम की धारा 10(2)(0) के अन्तर्गत किसी निष्कात सम्पत्ति के हस्तान्तरण को अनुमोदित करने की महिलाएँ।

(3) निष्कात सम्पत्ति प्रशासन, (केन्द्रीय), नियमावली, 1950 के नियम 30-के अन्तर्गत मामलों को हस्तान्तरण करने की शक्तियाँ।

2. इससे दिनांक 27-5-78 की अधिनूसना संख्या 1(30)/फ्रिमेंटल 75-एस०एस० 2 का प्रतिक्रमण किया जाता है।

[संख्या १(३०)/धि०से०/२५-एस०एस०२]
कौशल कुमार, महा भ्रभिरत्तक

S.O. 3900.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me as Custodian General by Sub-Section (3) of Section 55 of the Administration of Evacuee Property Act, 1950 (31 of 1950), I hereby delegate to Shri J. S. Mehta, Deputy Custodian General for the State of Rajasthan, appointed vide this Department's Notification No. 1(30)/Spl. Cell/75-SS.II dated 12-11-79, the following powers of the Custodian General:—

- (i) Powers under sections 24 and 27 of the Act.
 - (ii) Powers of approval of transfer of any of evacuee property under Section 10 (2) (0) of the Act.
 - (iii) Powers of transfer of cases under Rule 30-A of the Administration of Evacuee Property (Central) Rules, 1950.

2. This supersedes notification No. 1(30)/Spl. Cell/75-SS.II dated 27-5-78.

[No. 1(30)/Spl. Cell/75-SS.II.]

संचार मंत्रालय

(ग्राहक-सार घोष)

नई दिल्ली, 19 मई, 1976

कांगड़ा०३९०१.—विभागीय जांच (गवर्नरों की उपस्थिति का प्रबत्तन तथा दस्तावेजों का उत्पादन) प्रधिनियम, 1972 (1972 का 18) के खंड 4 के उपखंड (2) द्वारा प्रवत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एवं द्वारा निम्नलिखित प्राधिकारियों को समाचार केन्द्रीय सेवा युप ग या युप घ के लिए कमचारी से संबंधित जिसके विषय विभागीय जांच की जा सकती है और जो संबंधित प्राधिकारी के प्रश्नीत काम करता है, उक्त प्रधिनियम, के खंड 4 के उपखंड (1) द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार को प्रवत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते के लिये निम्नलिखित प्राधिकारियों का विशेष रूप से उल्लेख करती है, अर्थात् :—

- (1) सचिव, डाक-तार बोर्ड;
 - (2) पोस्टमास्टर जनरल;
 - (3) महाप्रबन्धक, दूरसंचार;
 - (4) महाप्रबन्धक, टेलीफोन;
 - (5) महाप्रबन्धक, दूरसंचार परियोजना;
 - (6) महाप्रबन्धक, दूरसंचार भंडार, कलकत्ता;
 - (7) महाप्रबन्धक, दूरसंचार क) रखाना, कलकत्ता;

- (8) भारतप्रबन्धक, तकनीकी और विकास संस्कृत जबलपुर;
 - (9) निवेशक, दूरसंचार प्रशिक्षण केन्द्र, जबलपुर;
 - (10) निवेशक, डाक औधन बीमा;
 - (11) फिला प्रबन्धक, टेलीफोन;

[सं० 201(61)/७५-मनुषासन-II]

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(Posts & Telegraphs Board)

New Delhi, the 18th May, 1976

S.O. 3901.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 4 of the Departmental Inquiries (Enforcement of Attendance of Witnesses and Production of Documents) Act, 1972 (18 of 1972), the Central Government hereby specifies the authorities mentioned below as the authorities to exercise the power conferred on the Central Government by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the said Act in relation to a Government servant in General Central Service-Group C or Group D against whom a departmental inquiry may be held, and working under the concerned authority, namely:—

1. Secretary, Posts and Telegraphs Board.
 2. Postmasters General;
 3. General Managers, Telecommunications;
 4. General Managers, Telephones;
 5. General Managers, Telecommunications Projects;
 6. General Manager, Telecommunication Stores, Calcutta,
 7. General Manager, Telecommunication Factories,
Calcutta;
 8. General Manager, Technical and Development Circle
Jabalpur;
 9. Director, Telecommunication Training Centre, Jabalpur;
 10. Director, Postal Life Insurance;
 11. District Managers, Telephones.

[No. 201/61/75-Disc. II]

अम मंदिर

मात्रा

नई दिल्ली, 22 अक्टूबर, 1879

प्रा० प्रा० 3902.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह है कि इससे उपायदू मनुष्यों में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स साउथ इंडिया कारपेरेशन (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, अमेरिका और निकासी एभिकर्ता कोजीत के प्रबल्लत्व से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक आधोगिक विवाद विचारान है।

धीर प्रसः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त शिवाद को स्थायतिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना आंशकीय सम्भवती है :

प्रतः, अग्रम, भौद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-के भौद्य धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (प) द्वारा प्रवर्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक भौद्योगिक अधिकारण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासांग अधिकारी श्री टी० सुरहसनम डेनियल होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय मंत्रालय में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त भौद्योगिक अधिकारण को स्थापितर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

四

क्षय मैसर्स साउथ इंडिया कारपोरेशन (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड कोषीन पत्तन पर अधेष्ठ और निकासी कार्य में नियोजित कर्मकार मजदूरी पुनरी-क्षण समिति की सिफारिशों के प्रभासार मजदूरी में पुनरीक्षण के हक्कावार

हैं और यहि हो, सो विभिन्न प्रश्नों के कर्मचारयों के लिए बेतनमान क्या होगे आहिए और ये बेतनमान किस तारीख से लागू होने चाहिए।

[खंडा एल-35011(2)/79-झ० 4(५)]

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd October, 1979

S.O. 3902.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs South India Corporation (Private) Limited, Clearing and Forwarding Agents, Cochin and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri T. Sudarsanam Daniel shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the workmen of Messrs South India Corporation (Private) Limited, Cochin, employed in Clearing and Forwarding work at Cochin Port are entitled to a revision of wages, in terms of Wage Revision Committee's Recommendations and if so, what should be the scales of pay for the different categories of employees and from what date should these scales should be applicable?

[No. L-35011 (2)/79-D-IV(A)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 9 नवम्बर, 1979

का० झा० 3903—इससे उपाधद अनुसूची में विनिष्ट ग्रोवोगिक विवाद केन्द्रीय सरकार ग्रोवोगिक ग्रधिकरण नं० 2, बम्बई के समक्ष लंबित पड़े हैं;

और इस अनुसूची में विनिष्ट एसे विवादों के संबंध में नियोजकों द्वारा उठाए गए प्रारम्भिक व्याहृत पर उक्त ग्रधिकरण ने 26 अप्रैल, 1979 को यास किए गए सामान्य आदेश द्वारा यह विवाद प्रकट किया कि डॉक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विभिन्नम) ग्रधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 2 के खंड (क) की परिभाषा का अस्तित्व सम्पर्क नोटीफिकेशनों हैं और केन्द्रीय सरकार सम्मित सरकार है जो इन विवादों को व्यापरिणयन के लिए आधिकरण को निर्देशित कर सकती है;

और, उक्त नियोजक ने व्यायिक आयुक्त, गोवा, दमन और दीवा, पनाजी की अदालत में पृथक विभेद सिविल भावेनपत्र थायर किए जिसमें उक्त ग्रधिकरण के आदेश को चुनौती दी गई थी;

और, ग्रधिकरण व्यायिक आयुक्त, गोवा, दमन और दीवा ने अपने नियंत्रण, दिनांक 14 सितम्बर, 1979 द्वारा उक्त ग्रधिकरण के आदेश को रद्द कर दिया और सभी रिट भावेनपत्रों को स्वीकार किया तथा ग्रधिकरण को यह नियोजन दिया कि दलीलें मुनने के पश्चात और यहि व्यावस्थक हो, तो विसम्बर, 1979 के अन्त तक कानून के अनुसार गवाही लेने के पश्चात, प्रारम्भिक व्याहृत पर यह नियंत्रण द्वारा यांत्रिक केन्द्रीय सरकार ग्रोवोगिक ग्रधिकरण नं० 2, बम्बई में इस समय कोई भी पीठासीन ग्रधिकारी नहीं है, इसलिए इन मामलों का किसी अन्य ग्रधिकरण द्वारा निपटारा, किया जाए।

इति, ग्रव, व्यायालय के उक्त नियोजन के अनुसार में और ग्रोवोगिक विवाद ग्रधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की द्वारा 33-ख की उपचारण (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त प्रक्रियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार,

इससे उपाधद अनुसूची में विनिष्ट ग्रोवोगिक विवादों से संबंध कार्य-व्याही को केन्द्रीय सरकार ग्रोवोगिक ग्रधिकरण नं० 2, बम्बई से वापस लेती है और उसे नियोजन के लिए उक्त ग्रधिकरण व्यायिक आयुक्त के उक्त नियोजन के केन्द्रीय सरकार ग्रोवोगिक ग्रधिकरण नं० 1, बम्बई को स्थानात्मक करती है।

अनुसूची

क्रमांक	मन्त्रालय का आदेश	संदर्भ नंबर	विवाद के पक्षकारों के नाम
1	2	3	4
1.	एल-36011/6/74-	1975 का सो० जी० मैसर्स इतालाय (गोवा)	पी० ए० डी० सी० एम०टी० आई० टी०-2/7 (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, दिनांक 26-12-1974
2.	एल-36011/7/75-झ० 4(५) दिनांक 8-५-1975।	1975 का सो० जी० आई०टी०-2/7	मैमन जनरल सुपरिनेटेंडर कम्पनी (इडिया) (प्र-वेट) लिमिटेड, बास्को-डागामा (गोवा) और उनके कर्मकार।
3.	एल-36011/8/74-	1975 का सो० जी० आई०टी०-2/3 दी०/डी०-4(५) दिनांक 18-1-1975	मैसर्स कार्गो इस्सैक्टर्स ए० ए० सुपरिनेटेंडन्ट कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, दास्तो-गान्गामा (गोवा) और उनके कर्मकार।
4.	77/1/70-पो०एप्ट शी० दिनांक 10-11-1971	1971 का सो० जी० आई०टी०-2/12	मैसर्स घेरायूटिक्स कैमिक्स रिसर्च का०पोरेशन, मारसो (गोवा) और उनके कर्मकार।

[सं० एल०-36011(6) 74-पी० एप्ट डी०/डी०-4(५)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 9th November, 1979

S.O. 3903.—Whereas the industrial disputes specified in the Schedule hereto annexed are pending disposal before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Bombay;

And, whereas, on a preliminary point raised by the employers in relation to such disputes specified in the Schedule, the said Tribunal by a common order passed on the 26th April, 1979, held that Samplers are dock workers within the meaning of clause (b) of section 2 of the Dock workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948) and that the Central Government is the appropriate Government competent to refer these disputes for adjudication to the Tribunal;

And, whereas, the said employers filed separate Special Civil Applications in the Court of the Judicial Commissioner, Goa, Daman and Diu at Panaji challenging the order passed by the said Tribunal;

And, whereas, the Additional Judicial Commissioner, Goa, Daman and Diu by his judgement dated the 14th September, 1979 set aside the order of the said Tribunal and allowed all the writ applications with the direction to the Tribunal to give a fresh decision on the preliminary point after hearing arguments and if necessary after taking evidence in accordance with law by the end of December, 1979 and further directed that as the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Bombay is at present without a Presiding Officer the matters be disposed of by some other Tribunal;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the said direction of the Court and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 33B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby withdraws the proceedings in relation to the industrial disputes specified in

the Schedule hereto annexed from the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Bombay, and transfers the same to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Bombay, for disposal in accordance with the said direction of the said Additional Judicial Commissioner.

SCHEDULE

S. No. and date of the Order of the Ministry	Ref. No.	Names of the parties to the dispute	
1	2	3	4
1. L-36011/6/74-P & D/ CMT. Dated the 26th December, 1974.	CGIT-2/1 of 1975	Messrs Italab (Goa) (Private) Limited, Margao (Goa) and their workmen.	
2. L-36011/7/75-D.IV(A) dated the 8th May, 1975.	CGIT-2/7 of 1975	Messrs General Superintendence Company (India) (Private) Limited Vasco-da-Gama (Goa), and their workmen.	
3. L-36011/8/74-P&D/ CMT/D.IV(A) dated the 18th January, 1975.	CGIT-2/3 of 1975	Messrs Cargo Inspectors and Superintendence Company Private Limited, Vasco-da-gama and their workmen.	
4. 77/1/70-P&D dated the 10th November, 1971.	CGIT-2/12 of 1971	Messrs Therapeutics Chemical Research Corporation, Margao (Goa), and their workmen.	

[No. L-36011(6)/74-P&D/D. IV (A)]
NAND LAL, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 17th November, 1979

S.O. 3904.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1949 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Madras Port Trust, Madras and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th November, 1979.

BEFORE THIRU T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL, B.A.,B.L.

PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,

MADRAS

Friday, the 2nd day of November, 1979

Industrial Disputes No. 3 of 1975

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 between the workman and the Management of Madras Port Trust, Madras]

BETWEEN

The workmen represented by

The General Secretary, Madras Port United Labour Union, Bhagat House, No. 1/73, Broadway, Madras-1.

AND

The Chairman, Madras Port Trust, North Beach Road, Madras-1.

REFERENCE :

Order No. L-33011/10/73-P & D/CMT/DIVA, dated 16-1-1975 of the Ministry of Labour, Government of India.

This dispute after having been remanded by the High Court, coming on for final hearing on Monday the 3rd day of September, 1979 upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statements and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Thiru R. Ganesan, Advocate for the workman and of Tvl. K. G. Rajan and T. Nagarajan, Advocates for the Management and having stood over till this day for consideration this Tribunal made the following.

AWARD

This is an Industrial dispute between the workman and the Management of Madras Port Trust, North Beach Road, Madras-1 referred to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government of India in Order No. L-33011/10/73-P & D/CMT/DIVA, dated 16th January, 1975 of the Ministry of Labour in respect of the following issues .

1. Whether the Madras Port have been discriminatory in their treatment of workmen who participated in strikes between 27-8-71 to 2-9-71 and between 12-4-1973 to 14-4-1973 and on 18-7-1973 ?

2. If so, how to remedy the situation ? and

3. To what relief or reliefs, if any, are the affected workmen entitled to ?

2. Respondent is the Chairman, Madras Port Trust, North Beach Road, Madras-1. The workman employed by the Madras Port Trust represented by the General Secretary, Madras Port United Labour Union, Madras-1 served a strike notice in July, 1971 on the Chairman, Madras Port Trust under Section 22(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and requested that the demands embodied be settled amicably. The Union had also pointed out that if the matter is not settled they will be constrained to go on strike after the expiry of the statutory period of notice. It is common ground that no settlement was reached and so the workers went on strike as follows :

(i) Marine Department.—700 workers of this department from 1 shift commencing at 6.m. on 27-8-1971.

(ii) Traffic Department.—All the Tally Clerks numbering nearly 350 from III Shift commencing at 10.30 p.m. on 27-8-1971.

(iii) Traffic Department.—Outdoor staff such as Delivery Clerk, Section Clerks, Godown Keepers & Messengers numbering about 250 from I shift commencing at 6 a.m. on 30-8-1971.

Subsequently a settlement was entered into on 3-9-1971 and the strike was called off. On 8-10-1971, the Board of Trustees of the Port Trust passed a Resolution No. 419 copy of which is marked as Ex. W-2 and M-3. In as much as there is no controversy about the terms of the Resolution, it is unnecessary for me to extract them once over. Suffice for me to point out that under this Resolution the administration of the Port Trust had decided how to deal with the period of strike of 700 workmen of Marine Department from 6.00 A.M. on 27-8-1971, 350 Tally Clerks of Traffic Department commencing from 10.30 P.M. on 27-8-1971 and about 250 Outdoor Staff such as Delivery Clerk, Section Clerk, Godown Keepers and Messengers from 6.00 A.M. on 30-8-1971 upto 2-9-1971. In short, the claim of the Union representing the workmen is that the terms of Resolution passed by the Board of Madras Port Trust is discriminatory and vindictive and of unfair labour practice. The details of discrimination are referred to in paragraph 14 of the claim statement filed by the Union. The Respondent-Management resisted the claim of the Union. My learned predecessor after recording evidence oral and documentary and after hearing the parties rendered an Award on 29-5-1975 holding that the claimants are not entitled to any relief. Aggrieved by this Award, the Union filed a Writ Petition W.P. No. 1609 of 1976 on the file of the High Court, Madras. Eventually the High Court allowed the Writ Petition on 17-3-1978 and the matter has been remanded to this Tribunal for fresh consideration on the issues referred for adjudication.

3. Admittedly, 700 workers of the Marine Department of the Respondent Madras Port Trust went on strike from I shift commencing at 6.00 A.M. on 27-8-1971 and all the Tally Clerks of Traffic Department numbering nearly 350 from III Shift commencing at 10.30 P.M. on 27-8-1971 and all Outdoor Staff of Traffic Department such as Delivery Clerk, Section Clerk, Godown Keepers and Messengers numbering about 250 from I Shift commencing at 6.00 A.M. on 30-8-1971 and this strike continued upto 2-9-1971, when, through the good offices of the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, Madras, the strike was called off from I Shift on 3rd September, 1971. Subsequently, the question arose as to how to deal with this period of strike from 27-8-1971 upto 2-9-1971. Ex. W-1 contains minutes of discussion held by the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, Madras through whose mediation the strike was called off on 3-9-1971. On 15-9-1971, the President of Madras Port Trust Employees' Union had addressed a communication to the Chairman, Madras Port Trust, Madras-I relating to the strike that took place between 27th August, 1971 and 2nd September, 1971, copy of which is marked as Ex. W-16. The request of the President of the Madras Port Trust Employees' Union was that the workman must be deemed to have been on duty during the strike period and should be paid wages accordingly. On 6-10-1971 the Acting Chairman, Madras Port Trust prepared a note regarding the treatment of absence of staff during the strike period in question, copy of which is marked as Ex. W-14. The Trustees of the Port of Madras held a meeting on 8-10-1971 to consider the treatment of absence of staff during the strike period and after discussion and taking into consideration the note prepared by the Chairman viz., Ex. W-14 and decided to treat the workmen during that strike period as a special case on the following terms :

- (i) In the case of employees who failed to report for duty throughout the period of strike (except for certified medical unfitness or authorised leave) i.e. from the II shift of the 27th August to the end of III shift of 2nd September, 1971 the period of absence be treated as "dies-non" which would mean—
 - (a) The period of strike will be treated as a gap in the services of the employees concerned without forfeiting their past services ;
 - (b) increment will be postponed to the extent of the number of days of absence ;
 - (c) such days will not count for earning leave ;
 - (d) encashment of Casual Leave under the "Casual leave-Cash it, if you like Scheme" will be affected for the year 1971 ;
- (ii) In the case of employees who reported for duty for one or more days during the strike period but failed to report for duty on other days, their absence be treated as casual leave, if they are eligible. If they have not sufficient casual leave to their credit they be granted earned leave or leave not due ;
- (iii) All affected employees who have not so far applied for leave will do so forthwith ;
 - and
- (iv) Employees covered by the Incentive Scheme for good attendance whose absence was treated as dies-non will forfeit the benefits as per the provisions of that scheme for the month of August.

4. It is significant to point out that on receipt of the decision of the Board of Trustees dated 8-10-1971 relating to the strike period from 27-8-1971 to 2-9-1971 neither the Union nor the individual workman concerned had demurred against the terms under which the period of absence would be treated. It may be borne in mind that all the workmen who are under strike from 27-8-1971 till 2-9-1971 had resumed work from I Shift of 3rd September, 1971. That being so, the General Secretary, Madras Port United Labour Union in his representation dated 28-11-1972 i.e., one year later reported to Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Central), Madras contending that contrary to the terms of agreement entered into on 2-9-1971 under Ex. W-1 before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Madras, the Respondent-Management had come to certain conclusions

on 8-10-1971, copy of which is marked as Ex. W-2. These facts can be gathered from Ex. W-4, copy of the conciliation failure report submitted by the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Madras to Government of India on 11-10-1973. From Ex. W-4, it can be seen that in their original report which formed the basis of the conciliation report there was no whisper of any comparison of the treatment given by the Management to its employees from 12-4-1973 to 14-4-1973. No doubt the Union refers to strike in May, 1969 and how the Management had treated that period. But the present reference made by the Government of India does not cover the period of strike May 1969 and to compare the same with the strike in question, viz., between 27-8-1971 and 2-9-1971. But instead of the reference enjoins this Tribunal to find out if the Madras Port Trust had been discriminatory in the treatment of workmen with the strikes held between 27-8-1971 and 2-9-1971, and between 12-4-1973 and 14-4-1973 and on 18-7-1973. As I referred to earlier the letter of the Union which started the proceedings culminating the present reference was dated 28-11-1972 and therefore there could not be any comparison with the treatment given by the Management to the striking workmen from 12-4-1973 to 14-4-1973 and 18-7-1973. If specifically strikes are not referred to but the issue is made in general in manner one can appreciate the form of reference. But as it is the reference has included certain matters which did not form the basis of complaint even by the workmen concerned. Support for my position can also be held from the claim statement filed in this dispute by the Union on 6-2-1975, wherein only the strike that took place in 1969 has been referred to in paragraph 11 of the Claim Statement and there is no whisper of the strike that took place from 12-4-1973 to 14-4-1973 and on 18-7-1973. In the circumstances, only in a general manner it has to be considered whether the treatment of the workmen of the Respondent-Management during the strike period from 27-8-1971 to 2-9-1971 is discriminatory and vindictive and smacks of double standard.

5. Learned counsel for the workmen Thiru R. Ganesan however restricted his arguments to a comparison of the treatment meted out to the workmen who participated in the strike held between 27-8-1971 and 2-9-1971 with the treatment of the strike that took place between 12-4-1973 and 14-4-1973. Even the claim statement filed by the Union does not seek to compare the benefits conferred on the workmen in the relevant strike period with the strike that took place on 18-7-1973. That apart, no material whatsoever has been placed to show the circumstances leading upto the strike that is said to have taken place on 18-7-1973 or as to the cause and extent of strike. In the circumstances, learned counsel Thiru R. Ganesan properly did not refer to the strike held on 18-7-1973. However, the submission of the learned counsel is that with regard to the strike during the period in question as compared with the strike that took place on 12-4-1973 to 14-4-1973 the Management of the Port Trust had taken discriminatory stand because the two strikes had been sponsored by two different Labour Unions. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Management Thiru R. G. Rajan points out that the Management was just magnanimous in dealing with this strike period from 27-8-1971 upto 2-9-1971 and have given the utmost benefit's to the defaulting strike-men and therefore by no stretch of imagination can it be said that the Management has discriminated the workmen concerned. On the materials placed I am in respectable agreement with the stand of the respondent management. Here are my reasons : In the first place, the strike during the relevant period as for a period of five days commencing from I shift of 27th August, 1971 upto III shift of 2nd September, 1971. But the strike on 12th April, 1973 was only lightning strike which lasted only for one day. The proceedings of the Trustees with regard to the relevant period is found in Ex. M-3 while that relating to 12th April, 1973 is found in Ex. M-5. Even on a comparison of the terms found in Ex. M-3 and M-5 it would disclose that by and large the terms of treatment were almost the same. But then, the decision under Ex. M-3 took place on 8th October, 1971 while the decision under Ex. M-5 was on 26th April, 1973. As pointed out by the learned counsel for the Management in the case of a workmen's right what is good today will not be good tomorrow. On the other hand, the rights of workmen are getting enlarged day by day beyond recognition and therefore even if certain benefits had been conferred on 26th April, 1973, they cannot be good or held to be good for an appreciation of the claim on 8th

October, 1971. If the contention of the workmen were that larger benefits had been given under Ex. M-3 while Ex. M-3 does not confer those benefits, then there is considerable force in the submission. But in the instant case it is a converse case where the benefits conferred in 1973 are sought to be transposed to 1971. Industrial law does not know any doctrine of relation back. Merely because in both Ex. M-3 and M-5, the Trustees had agreed to treat the period as "Dies non", very much does not turn round to this particular term. Ex. W-6, an extract from 'Law Lexicon of British India' succinctly described "Dies non". I may also add that this phrase "Dies non" originates from Latin where it means 'Days on which Judges do not sit' (according to 20th Century Chambers dictionary). Therefore, the nomenclature that the Management gave to the period of strike does not necessarily indicate how the particular period should have been treated. The Rule still holds good in Industrial Law that no pay for no work. Viewed in this background the terms of Ex. M-3 cannot be held to be vindictive or discriminatory. I may also add that although the Management took the decision on 8-10-1971 the Union had apparently accepted the terms of the Management and did not raise its little finger. Until 13 months later when on 28-11-1972, they represented to the Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Central), Madras about the treatment by the Management of the workmen during the strike period contrary to the terms agreed before the Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Central), Madras on 1st and 2nd September, 1971, copy of which is marked as Ex. W-1. Incidentally, I may also point out that my learned predecessor had clearly given a finding that the resolution of the Management dated 8-10-1971 does not offend any of the terms of the Settlement Ex. W-1. On the other hand the terms of Ex. M-3 are in perfect tune with the tenure of agreement entered into under Ex. W-1. Thus the claim of the Union is bereft of any merit and is quite stale. The workmen are not entitled to any further relief. These points are accordingly answered against the workmen.

6. In the result, an award is passed holding that the claimants are not entitled to any relief. In order to maintain and continue industrial peace, I direct the parties to bear their respective costs.

Dated, this 2nd day of November, 1979.

Sd/-

T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-33011(3)/78-D.IV(A)]
NAND LAL, Desk Officer.

Witnesses examined (Before remand)

For Workmen :

WW-1.—Thiru C. Gopalakrishnan.
WW-2.—Thiru R. Babu Rao.
WW-3.—Thiru A. Raju.

For Management :

Nil.

Documents Marked (Before remand)

For Workmen :

W-1.—Minutes of discussions held by Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Madras on 1-9-1971 and 2-9-71 (Copy).

W-2/8-10-71.—Copy of the extract from the Proceedings of the Trustees of the Port of Madras.

W-3/26-4-73.—Copy of the extract from the Proceedings of the Trustees of the Port of Madras.

W-4/11-10-73.—Copy of the failure of conciliation Report.

W-5.—Schedule of strikes in Madras Port Trust from May 1969 to July 1973 (Copy).

W-6.—Law Lexicon of British India (Copy).

W-7/16-4-75.—Annual Returns prescribed under Section 28 of the Trade Union Act 1926 for the year ending 31-12-1974 (Copy).

W-8/26-4-75.—Annual Returns prescribed under Section 28 of the Trade Union Act 1926 for the year ending 31-12-72 (Copy).

W-9.—List of fully paid membership for the year 1970.

W-10.—Minutes of the Board Meeting held on 1-8-1969.

W-11/16-5-69.—Note of the Chairman, Madras Port Trust (Copy).

W-12/20-5-69.—Note of the Chairman, Madras Port Trust (Copy).

W-13/21-7-69.—Note of the Chairman, Madras Port Trust (Copy).

W-14/6-10-71.—Note of the Chairman, Madras Port Trust (Copy).

W-15/23-8-73.—Note of the Chairman, Madras Port Trust (Copy).

W-16/15-9-71.—Copy of letter from the President, The Madras Port Trust Employees' Union to the Chairman, Madras Port Trust, Madras-1.

For Management :

M-1/23-5-79.—Copy of Resolution No. 89 of the Board.

M-2/1-8-69.—Copy of Resolution No. 242 of the Board.

M-3/8-10-71.—Copy of Resolution No. 419 of the Board.

M-4/22-10-71.—Copy of Resolution No. 436 of the Board.

M-5/26-4-73.—Copy of Resolution No. 34 of the Board.

M-6/24-8-73.—Copy of Resolution No. 329 of the Board.

M-7.—Seniority list of Tally Clerks (Register as on 1-4-1974).

M-8.—Schedule of Establishment of staff as on 1-4-71 (Register).

After remand

NIL

Sd/-

T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL, Industrial Tribunal

प्रावेश

मई दिल्ली, 14 अक्टूबर, 1979

का० धा० 3905 —केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायद मनुसूची में विभिन्न विषयों के बारे में सिर्फ़ती कोयलरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड, रामगुण्डम डिवीजन 4, जिला करीमनगर, घास्त्र प्रेश के प्रबन्धतांत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों प्रौद उनके कर्मकारों की ओर एक घौषणागत विषयान है;

भौत यह: केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विषय को न्यायिकीयन के लिए निर्देशित करना आवश्यक समझती है;

प्रत: धा०, घौषणागत विषय अ०.नियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क भीर धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के अंड (घ) धारा प्रदत्त शाकितयों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक घौषणागत अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एम० श्रीनिश्चास राव होंगे। जिसका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा भौत उक्त विषय को उक्स घौषणागत अधिकरण को न्यायिकीयन के लिए निर्वैशित करती है।

ममुसूची

करा मंडलीय प्रवीक्षक, रामगुन्डम इंजीनियर-4, मिगरेनी को. पर्सनल कम्पनी एनिटेड, गोदावरी खानी की अंतर्वन-काल्पन प्रोजेक्ट एसिया, जिला भरीमतगार, अन्ध्र प्रदेश के श्रीमी 1 ऐकेनिक थो एम० पप्पाह के लिए एक नई कंपनी परिवर्ती प्रश्निं निर्धारित करने सक्षमी कार्यकारी व्यवस्थित है ? यदि नहो, तो विधिन कर्मकार किस अनुभोग का लक्ष्य है ?

[संख्या प्रा०-21011(14)/79-टॉ० 4(वी०)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 14th November, 1979

S.O. 3905.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramagundam Division IV, Karimnagar District Andhra Pradesh and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri M. Srinivasa Rao shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the Divisional Superintendent, Ramagundam Division, IV, Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Godavarikhani in fixing the probation period for one year of Shri M. Papaiah, Gr. I Mechanic of Open Cast Project Area, Karimnagar District, Andhra Pradesh is justified. If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?

[No. L-21011(14)/79-D. IV(B).]

New Delhi, the 16th November, 1979

S.O. 3906.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (17 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta in the industrial dispute between the employer in relation to the management of Benalee Colliery, Satgram Sub-Area, Eastern Coalfields Limited, Raniganj and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 14th November, 1979.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL :
CALCUTTA

Reference No. 27 of 1978

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Benalee Colliery, Satgram Sub-Area, Eastern Coalfields Limited, Raniganj.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Sri Justice S. K. Mukherjee—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers—Sri Nikhilesh Das, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Sri A. K. Lal Gupta, Advocate.

State : West Bengal

Industry : Coal Mines

AWARD

By Order No. L-19012(32)/77-D.IV(B) dated 10th March, 1978, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, referred an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Benalee Colliery, Satgram Sub-Area, Eastern Coalfields Limited, Raniganj and their workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication. The Schedule to the order of reference reads :

"Whether the action of the management of Benalee Colliery, Satgram Sub-Area of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Limited in not taking in employment Shri Bijoy Shankar Dwivedi (Dubey), General Clerk at Benalee Colliery consequent upon take-over of the colliery with effect from 28th February, 1973 is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. The case of the concerned workman as pleaded is that he was employed by the Director, Nimcha Coal Company Ltd., on a consolidated salary of Rs. 150 per month and Rs. 28 per week, as a general clerk in Benalee Colliery. At that time the colliery was lying closed. But the stores of the workshop attached to it were kept open. The concerned workman was working as store keeper in the said stores.

3. The concerned workman was on leave in January, 1973. The management of the coal mine was taken over by the Central Government under the Coal Mines (Taking Over of Management) Ordinance, 1973. Physical possession of the colliery was taken on 28th February, 1973. The concerned workman was not allowed to resume duty illegally on account of confusion on the part of Mr. S. K. Roy, the Manager of the Colliery.

4. After take over of management and subsequent nationalisation of coal mines the concerned workman made representations for employment. Employment was denied to him.

5. The concerned workman claims to be in continuous service since the day of his appointment. He also claims back wages for the period of his forced idleness and other benefits that might be found due to him.

6. The management in its written statement disputed the locus standi of the union to sponsor the dispute on behalf of the concerned workman. The colliery was lying closed when the Coal Mines (Taking Over of Management) Ordinance, 1973 came into force. In fact, management was not taken over till 28th February, 1973. The concerned workman was not present at the time of take over. It was only in September, 1973 that the mine was re-opened.

7. In paragraph 6 of the writer's statement it is stated that it transpired in course of conciliation proceedings that the concerned workman was a mere casual workman earning wages at Rs. 4 per day on the dates he was working which was paid on vouchers. His employment was of a precarious nature and he could not be deemed to be a workman of the mine to attract the provisions of Section 14 of the Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act which came into force from 1st May, 1973. In paragraph 8 it is stated that from the available papers it would appear that the concerned workman approached the management for employment sometime after the reopening of the mine in September, 1973 and he was informed that since no work of clerical nature was available, the management was not in a position to offer him any work.

8. It is alleged in paragraph 11 that even when the colliery was closed, in collusion with the previous management certain papers were manufactured for the purpose of showing that the concerned workman was in employment of the colliery as a general clerk and the present employers are within their rights in not placing any reliance upon the same.

9. In the Rejoinder of the workmen it is stated that the concerned workman was a permanent workman as defined in the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Central Rules, Schedule 1(a). He was not engaged in any job of casual nature. He reported for duty in February, 1973 and not in September, 1973. Having been on authorised leave he continued in service from the date of take over till nationalisation and the relationship of employer and employee subsisted all the time.

10. In their rejoinder, it is stated on behalf of the management that even if the concerned workman had been employed on a casual basis on daily rate at times, that would not give him right to employment, he not having been a workman within the meaning of the Industrial Disputes Act having regard to the fact that admittedly he was not in employment on the date of take over, or later.

11. The concerned workman in his evidence stated that he was in employment of the Benalee Colliery from September, 1972. The collieries were owned by Nimcha Coal Company Limited of which one Rajen Nahata was the Director. He used to look after Nimcha and Benalee collieries owned by the company. The concerned workman did the job of a General Clerk after he was appointed. He then produced a of appointment dated 24th August, 1972, marked Ext. W-1. At that time the mine was lying closed for labour trouble. It was going to be started again. The Manager of the colliery was one Mr. Sukumar Roy. The concerned workman said that he maintained the attendance register and also issued store materials, mainly cement and lime. He produced, some slips for issue of materials in a bundle which are in his handwriting and signed by the Manager S. K. Roy, Ext. W-2. He also produced two other bundles, Exts. W-3 and W-4, signed by the Manager. His signature does not appear in those slips nor are they in his handwriting. He deposed that he was paid by the Director Rs. 150 per month as his salary and Rs. 28 per week as allowance. Cash books and vouchers were maintained at the colliery. There was an attendance register also. Monthly payments of Benalee colliery were made at Nimcha colliery through those registers. He used to receive payment by signing vouchers. He then proved a letter dated 31st March, 1972 addressed to the Custodian, Coal Mines Authority Ltd., by Rajen Nahata under a facsimile signature, Ext. W-5. It is stated there that Nimcha Coal Company Ltd. were submitting certain records in respect of payments made to the staff and workers of Benalee colliery. I take it that the date 31st March, 1972 should be read as 31st March, 1973. The letter referred to a letter dated 23rd March, 1973. It does not, however, contain any serial number. Then he proved two vouchers dated 31st January, 1973 and two more vouchers dated 28-2-1973, signed by R. Nahata, in respect of the amounts payable to the Manager Sri S. Roy being his salary for the months January and February, 1973 and in respect of the amounts payable to the staff being their salaries for the months of January and February 1973 respectively "as per sheets attached" Ex. W-6. In the attached sheets, which are typed and unsigned, names of 30 employees including the concerned workman are shown. The amount payable to the concerned workman is stated to be Rs. 150 as his monthly salary.

12. The deponent said that he worked upto December, 1972. Then he went on leave for one month. Leave was sanctioned by the Manager S. K. Roy. He had applied in writing for the leave but did not preserve any copy of the application. He reported for duty at the colliery on 7th February, 1973. The Manager did not allow him to join on the ground that the company had been nationalised and there was no material in the stores. Moreover, the colliery was lying closed. When the colliery was taken over by the Government he reported again for duty to the Manager. The Manager told him that all the records had been sent to the Group office and he had forgotten to put his name in the list. He advised him in March 1973 to apply for service. Thereafter a letter addressed to the General Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Congress by the Assistant Chief Personnel Officer was tendered by consent, Ext. W-7. In that letter the writer intimated the remarks of the Deputy Chief Personnel Officer that as job regulation/absorption was closed, the regularisation of the concerned workman and one Raghubans Singh could not be considered. Their cases might be considered against sanctioned vacancies in future along with others. In cross-examination the concerned workman stated that he was employed in Benalee colliery in 1967. That was a casual appointment. In 1972 he got a permanent appointment. His previous employment used to run for one or two months at intervals. The colliery was closed down in 1970. Preparations were going on for starting the colliery when he was appointed in August, 1972. From September 1972 to 5th January, 1973 he worked in the colliery and from 6th January, 1973 he went on leave for one month. The leave was granted by the Manager. He used to take Rs. 150 from the Director on voucher and Rs. 28 per week from the colliery on kachcha

slips. He denied that he was a casual worker at the material time. He claimed to be a regular workman.

13. One Madan Gopal Bangur deposed on behalf of the concerned workman. His evidence was that he was looking after the affairs of the Nimcha Coal Company Ltd. after the collieries were taken over by the State, for the purpose of receiving compensation. He came into the picture in 1974. He made it quite clear that he had no knowledge of the affairs of the company at the time when Benalee colliery was functioning nor did he have any knowledge of the facts of the case. He said that he knew Rajendra Kumar Nahata. Sri Nahata was staying at 1/1 Rowland Row at the registered office of the Company. He was a director of the company. He is in Calcutta but lying ill. He will be about 35 years old. The deponent saw him only a few days before. He comes out and visits friends and relatives.

14. On behalf of the management, evidence was led by Sri Sukumar Roy, Mining Engineer, Sri Biswanath Singh, Senior Personnel Officer, Modern Satgram Colliery and Sri L. N. Mallick, Area officer of Satgram area.

15. Sri L. N. Mallick said that he was the Manager of Benalee colliery from 1967 to 1969. In 1969 when he left Benalee colliery the concerned workman was working there. He was a casual workman and was being paid by vouchers.

16. Sri Sukumar Roy stated in his evidence that on 29th September, 1972 he joined Benalee colliery. At that time it was a closed mine. The mine had closed in 1970. He deposed that he knew the concerned workman. On 3rd or 4th October, 1972 the Director Rajen Nahata came to him with the concerned workman and asked him if he could give him some work. At first he was not agreeable to have him. Then the Director suggested that he might be appointed as a store boy to issue store materials to workmen and to receive back store materials. To that he agreed. He was appointed as a casual worker on the basis of no work no pay. At that time some preparatory work was going on. On 30th or 31st October, 1972 there was a clash between two groups of people. As a result work was suspended in the colliery. By the end of October part of the work was started. During November the work continued on piece-meal basis, that is to say, on some day some people were engaged and on other days other people were engaged for specific jobs. Upto middle of December the same system continued. Thereafter all the workman who had worked were paid on or about 6th or 7th January, 1973. The Director asked him to suspend all further operations until further instructions, only retaining the security people, one electrician and one register keeper. On 31st January announcement was made for taking over of the colliery. Management was actually taken over on 28th February, 1973. After take over he continued to act as Manager till 31st August 1973. He said that he did not have any hand in the preparation of the voucher or the list, Ext. W-6, nor did he know the handwriting in the body of the voucher dated 31st January, 1973. The signature was of Rajen Nahata, Director. The Custodian asked him for the cash book. Thereupon he spoke to Shri Nahata for its production. In April, 1973 he brought the cash book and asked him to submit the same to the custodian. He told Nahata that as it was to be produced by the old management, it should be done by someone on their behalf. Then Nahata went to the Sub-area office, at that time known as Group office, and submitted the same to the Group Accounts Officer. As regards the letter of appointment dated 24th August, 1972 he said he had no knowledge of it nor did he have anything to do with it. Only those persons who were on duty on 28th February, 1973 were retained in service. No workman was on leave on that date. At that time no question of leave arose as they were working on no work no pay basis. Only those people who were handed over to him by the old management on 8th January, 1973 he was entitled to retain. He could not remember whether the concerned workman was present on 28th February, 1973. The name of the concerned workman was not included in the list. The reason why he did not include his name in the list was that there were many casual workers in the colliery who were all clamouring for employment.

17. Sri Roy said in cross-examination that the designation of the concerned workman was store boy. He was a casual workman. He did not remember if he worked upto December, 1972 because he was working on no work no pay basis.

He did not remember if he was granted any leave by him at any time. He was receiving wages of Rs. 4 per day when he worked as a casual workman. Rs. 150 shown on the typed list as enclosure to Ext. W-8 was never paid from the till of the colliery. Whether it was paid from some other source he did not know.

18. Sri Biswanath Singh deposed that Ext. W-9 is a true copy of the original letter dated 26/27th October, 1973 addressed by him to the Area Personnel Officer. His report, he said, was based on a letter of Sri S. K. Roy, erstwhile Manager of Benalee Colliery. It was also based on 2 or 3 registers and a few bundles of vouchers. He examined the registers and the vouchers himself. So far as he could remember there was a payment register. In the register there were some 35 to 40 names of workmen as recorded by the erstwhile management. He had seen Ext. W-5, the forwarding letter from the erstwhile owner of the colliery to the Custodian. He said it was not easy for him to remember but he thought he had inspected all the documents mentioned in Ext. W-5.

19. I propose to deal briefly with the exhibits in this case. By the letter dated 24th August, 1972, Ext. W-1, under the signature of R. K. Nahata, the concerned workman was purported to have been appointed as general clerk on a consolidated salary of Rs. 150 per month. In the concluding paragraph of the letter the concerned workman was asked to sign the duplicate copy of the letter as a token of acceptance if the terms and conditions were found acceptable by him. No such acceptance is on record. I have already described Exts. W-2, W-3 and W-4 which are bundles of slips for issue of stores. It appears that the concerned workman wrote slips in bundle Ext. W-2. All these slips are of October, November and December 1972. He had nothing to do with Exts. W-3 and W-4, two other bundles of similar slips. The letter dated 31st March, 1972, Ext. W-5 is addressed to the Custodian, Coal Mines Authority, Satgram Group by Nahata. As I have already said the date should be read as 31st March, 1973. By this letter Nahata appears to have submitted two cash books for the period from 10-6-72 to 28-2-73 and a number of colliery vouchers. This letter bears a facsimile signature of Nahata who did not depose at the hearing. I have already dealt with the four vouchers along with the attached sheets, Ext. W-6 and W-7. Ext. W-9 is a letter dated 26th October, 1973 from Sri B. M. Singh, Group Personnel Officer to the Area Personnel Officer to which reference has already been made. The letter reads as follows :

"Ref. No. 5253

Dated 26/27 October 73.

The Area Personal Officer
Area No. ; III.
Sethia Bhawan
Dear Sir,

Sub : (Case of Sri Bijoy Shankar Dwivedi)

Please find enclosed an application record from Sri Bijoy Shankar Dwivedi for employment at Benalee Colliery.

I had forwarded this application to Sri Roy, Manager, North Brook Colliery who was previously Manager Benalee Colliery at the relevant time for his guidance as to the facts of his case. A copy of Sri Roy's note on the subject is attached with for your perusal.

From the above as well as from records of Benalee Colliery available in sub Area Office it appears he was employed at Benalee Colliery and as such his request for being provided with a job there may please be found to be given.

It may be incidentally mentioned here that he is the son of the priest of Benalee temple and is held in esteem by many and as such it is hoped he will prove quite helpful.

Yours faithfully,
Sd. B. N. Singh: G.P.O."

20. The main questions which have to be decided are : (a) whether the concerned workman was a workman in the employment of Benalee Colliery at the material time ? (b) if he was a workman, whether he was a regular workman as he claims to be at a monthly salary of Rs. 150 and Rs. 28 per week or merely a casual workman as was deposed by Sri S. K. Roy, the erstwhile Manager of the colliery.

21. The concerned workman has relied on the letter of appointment dated 24th August, 1972 and on the unsigned sheets attached to the vouchers in Ext. W-6. So far as the lists are concerned they are unsigned. From the vouchers to which these typed lists are said to be attached, the names of the employees for whose wages the sum of Rs. 4,100 is required on 31st January, 1973 and on 28th February, 1973 cannot be ascertained. The name of the concerned workman appears in the unsigned lists. Although the lists and the vouchers have formally gone in as exhibits, it is to be borne in mind that strictly speaking, the body of the vouchers have not been proved. Sri S. K. Roy, the Manager deposed that he could not recognise the handwriting. Shri Nahata who signed the vouchers did not depose as to the truth of the facts stated in the vouchers or in the unsigned lists. Sri Roy, the Manager of the colliery disclaimed any knowledge of these vouchers. In these circumstances evidence of Sri Nahata was all the more necessary.

22. As regards the letter of appointment dated 24th August, 1972, the Manager said that he had no knowledge of any letter of that description. This document has again been formally proved, that is to say, by proving the signature of Nahata. Be that as it may, the fact that he was appointed as a regular workman on a salary of Rs. 150 per month and Rs. 28 per week ought to have been established by the evidence of Shri Nahata. There is evidence that Sri Nahata was staying at 1/1, Rowl and Row at the registered office of the company. Sri M. Bangur deposed that Nahata is in Calcutta. He was seen a few days before he gave his evidence. He also deposed that Nahata visits friends and relations. It is quite clear that Nahata was available to give evidence. In fact, I gave repeated opportunities to the learned advocate appearing on behalf of the concerned workman to call Sri Nahata. There is evidence that Nahata came to see the Manager on 3rd or 4th October, 1972 and persuaded the Manager to appoint the concerned workman as a store boy as a casual worker on the basis of no work no pay. If the Manager is to be believed and I do not see why he should not be, it is strange that Nahata did not tell him that the concerned workman had been appointed as a regular workman by a letter of appointment issued on 24th August 1972. The documents on which his case for employment as a regular workman on a salary rests, ought not to be, in my opinion, accepted as evidence of facts in relation to the concerned workman as stated therein.

23. The concerned workman in the pleadings has largely relied on a note of Sri S. Roy, former Manager of Benalee Colliery, a copy of which has been made Annexure B to the written statement of the workman. This note has not been made an exhibit. Moreover, it was not put to Sri Roy in cross-examination. It is the categorical evidence of Sri Roy that the concerned workman worked in the colliery as a casual workman throughout on no work no pay basis. He denied that he was a regular workman on a monthly salary.

24. Sri B. Singh has deposed that in his letter to the Area Personnel Manager, Ext. W-9, he was guided by the note of Sri S. K. Roy. Although in the letter it is stated that a copy of Sri Roy's note is attached for perusal of the Area Personal Officer, no such note was exhibited along with Ext. W-9. Sri Singh's letter is largely based on Roy's note. It is also based on certain records.

25. It must be remembered that Sri Singh nowhere says in his letter or in his evidence that the concerned workman was in employment as a regular workman. He has merely stated that he was in employment at Benalee Colliery and as such his request for being provided with a job might be acceded to. On the basis of the evidence given before me, it seems to me that Sri S. K. Roy, the Manager stated the position correctly, namely, that the concerned workman was a casual workman on no work no pay basis. The case that he was a regular workman on a salary of Rs. 150 per month and allowance of Rs. 28 per week must be rejected.

26. It is now to be seen what are the rights of the concerned workman under the Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1973, he having been a casual workman on no work no pay basis. Sub-section (1) of Section 14 provides that every person who was a workman with in the meaning of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and has been immediately before the appointed day, in the employment of a coal mine shall become on and from the appointed date an employee of the Central Government or as the case may be, the Government Company in which the right, title and interest of such mine have vested under the Act. In the contemplation of the

definition of 'workman' in the Industrial Disputes Act no distinction has been made between a casual workman and a regular workman. I am therefore of the view that a casual workman is entitled to the benefit of Section 14(1). The question now arises whether he was in the employment of Benalee Colliery on the appointed day i.e. on 1st May, 1973. It also raises a question whether he was in the employment on the day when by operation of law the management of coal mines was taken over by the State that is on 31st January, 1973. The management of Benalee Colliery was in fact taken over on 28th February, 1973. The case of the concerned workman in the pleadings is that he was on authorised leave in January, 1973 when the management of the coal mine became vested in the Central Government under the Coal Mines (Taking Over of Management) Ordinance, 1973. In his evidence the concerned workman deposed that he worked upto December, 1972. Thereafter he left for his home on leave for one month. He reported for duty at the colliery on 7th February, 1973. Therefore admittedly he was not working on 31st January, 1973. It is also not his case that he was working on 1st May, 1973. The question whether he was actually on leave assumes some importance, because if he was on authorised leave then his absence from duty during the period of leave will not be of any consequence. Sri S. K. Roy, Manager, in his evidence has said that no question of leave arose as the workman was working on no work no pay basis. Of course he said that he could not remember if he had granted any leave to the concerned workman at any time. But if he is to be believed, and I do believe him, there was no question of leave in cases of workmen who were working on no work no pay basis. It is highly improbable that any application for leave was made by the concerned workman. The concerned workman admitted that he had no document to show from which it could be seen that he had applied for leave. He said he did apply in writing and leave was sanctioned, but he did not have any copy of his application. As I said, if no application for leave was required from a casual workman working on no work no pay basis, there could be no occasion for sanctioning any leave. In Annexure B to the workman's pleading, that is to say, the copy of an alleged note by Sri Roy, it is stated, "that unfortunately at the time of the above order from the Director (8-1-78) Sri Dubey was on leave". This note has not been proved nor has it been made an exhibit. What is more it was not suggested to Sri S. Roy, the Manager, in cross-examination that he had stated in his note that the concerned workman was on leave. In these circumstances, I accept the evidence of Sri S. Roy and on a careful consideration of his evidence as a whole I reject the case that the concerned workman was on leave at the material time. He was therefore not in employment of the colliery on 31st January, 1973 and he is not therefore entitled to the benefit of Section 14(1) of the Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1973 if any.

27. In the view I have taken, I hold that the action of the management of Benalee Colliery, Satgram Sub-area of Messrs Eastern Coal Fields Limited in not taking in employment Sri Bijoy Shanker Dwivedi (Dubey), General Clerk at Benalee Colliery consequent upon the take-over of the Colliery with effect from 28th February, 1973 is justified and he is therefore not entitled to any relief.

Dated, Calcutta, The 6th November, 1979.

S. K. MUKHERJEA, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-19012(32)/77-D.IV(B)]

SHASHI BHUSHAN, Desk Officer.

मई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 1979

का० आ० 3907.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्जनरायणी प्राइवेट स्टोर्स, 2ए शेक्सपियर सारणी, कलकत्ता-71 जिसके अस्तांत गुरु गोविन्द पट, पटना सिटी, बिहार, स्थित उसकी भाषा भी है, नाम स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की व्युत्पत्ति इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए :

प्रतः, प्रब, उक्त अधिनियम की घारा 1 की उपभारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जून, 1977 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[स० एस० 35017/17/78-पी० एफ० II]

New Delhi, the 15th November, 1979

S.O. 3907.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Narayani Iron Stores, 2A, Shakespeare Sarani, Calcutta-71 including its branch at Guru Govind Path Patna City, (Bihar), have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of June, 1977.

[No. S. 35017/17/78-PF.II]

का० आ० 3908.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्जनरायणी केमिकल्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 139/बी/1, आनन्द पालित रोड, एनटैली, कलकत्ता-14, जिसके अस्तांत 112/212/1, स्वरूप नगर, कानपुर-2, स्थित उसकी भाषा भी है, नाम स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों को व्युत्पत्ति इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

प्रतः, प्रब, उक्त अधिनियम की घारा 1 की उपभारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जूनवारी, 1979 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[स० एस० 35017/48/79-पी० एफ० II(i)]

S.O. 3908.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Ravi Chemicals (Private) Limited, 139/B/1, Ananda Palit Road, Entally, Calcutta-14 including its branch at 112/212/1, Swaroop Nagar, Kanpur-2, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, 1979.

[No. S. 35017/48/79-PF.II(i)]

का० आ० 3909.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की घारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, संबद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करते के पश्चात् 1 जूनवारी, 1979 से मैसर्जनरायणी केमिकल्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 139/बी/1, आनन्द पालित रोड, एनटैली, कलकत्ता-14, जिसके अस्तांत 112/212/1, स्वरूप नगर, कानपुर-2, स्थित उसकी भाषा भी है, नाम स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विस्तृत करती है।

[का० स० एस० 35017/48/79-पी० एफ०-II(ii)]

S.O. 3909.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of January, 1979 the establishment known as Messrs. Ravi Chemicals (Private) Limited 139/B/1, Ananda Pal Road, Entally, Calcutta-14 including its branch at 112/212/1, Swaroop Nagar, Kanpur-2, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35017/48/79-PF II(ii)]

का०आ० ३९१०.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैमर्स कार्मचारी वाले गणना संघर्ष, २७, मिर्जा नाशिर स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-१६, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुमतलगा इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रक्रीय उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का १९) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त स्थापन की धारा १ की उपधारा (५) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना १ जनवरी, १९७९ को प्रकृत हुई समझी जाएगी।

[म० एम० ३५०१७/५०/७९-पी०एम० २]

S.O. 3910.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Kalikata Butec Pragati Sangsht, 27, Mirza Calb Street, Calcutta-16, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, 1979.

[No. S. 35017/50/79-PF II]

का०आ० ३९११.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैमर्स शिपाई-मेंटल कैन्टिन, नेहां नियंत्रक का कार्यालय, भारत सरकार, १५, आर० एन० भूमिंजी रोड, कलकत्ता-१, नाम स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों को बहुमतलगा इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रक्रीय उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का १९) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त स्थापन की धारा १ की उपधारा (५) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त स्थापन के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना ३१ अगस्त, १९७८ को प्रकृत हुई समझी जाएगी।

[म० एम० ३५०१७/५२/७९-पी०एफ० २]

S.O. 3911.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Departmental Canteen, Office of the Controller of Accounts, Government of India, 15, R. N. Mukherjee Road, Calcutta-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of August, 1978.

[No. S-35017/52/79-PF.II]

का०आ० ३९१२.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैमर्स धारा १ का अंगठी, पौ०-१८ भी, नई स० आर० टॉ० रोड, कलकत्ता-१४, नाम स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियाजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुमतलगा इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रक्रीय उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का १९) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा १ की उपधारा (५) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करता है।

यह अधिसूचना ३१ दिसम्बर, १९७७ को प्रकृत हुई समझी जाएगी।

[म० एम० ३५०१७/५३/७९-पी०एफ० २]

S.O. 3912.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Ashoke Agency, P-18 B, New C. I. T. Road, Calcutta-14, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of December, 1977.

[No. S. 35017/53/79-PF. II]

का०आ० ३९१३.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैमर्स शोति-लाल एण्ड ब्रॉथर्स, ११४-ओ गवर्नर्मेंट इण्डस्ट्रियल इन्स्टीटी फॉइंडिंग्स (पश्चिम) भुम्बई-६७, नाम स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुमतलगा इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रक्रीय उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का १९) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त स्थापन की धारा १ की उपधारा (५) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त स्थापन के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना १ जनवरी, १९७९ को प्रकृत हुई समझी जाएगी।

[म० एम० ३५०१८/८१/७९-पी०एफ० २]

S.O. 3913.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Shantilal and Brothers, 114-B, Government Industrial Estate, Kandivli (West) Bombay-67, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, 1979.

[No. S. 35018/8/81/79-PF. II]

का०आ० ३९१४.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैमर्स निरलोन सिन्योटिक फाइबर्स एण्ड कॉमिक्स लिमिटेड, कन्वेयर बेलिंग, डिविजन रोडा, एम० आर० ओ० स० इस्टेट श्रावण, रोडा, जिला कोकाबा, जिसके मत्तगत (१) १, थोरिएण्ड रो, पार्क, मकांग, कलकत्ता-१७ और (२) ११५/१-ओ, माउंटेन्स, मध्यस-१८, खिंच उक्त कार्यालय थोड़ी शाकाएं थी हैं, नाम स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुमतलगा इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रक्रीय उपबंध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का १९) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः यद्यपि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपर्युक्त उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 मई, 1978 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस. 35018/(82)/79-पी० एफ०-2(i)]

S.O. 3914.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Nirlon Synthetic Fibres and Chemicals Limited, Conveyor Belting Division Roha, MIDC Estate, Dhatav, Roha, District Kolaba, including its branches at (1) 1, Orient Row, Park Circus, Calcutta-17 and (2) 115/1-B, Mowbray Road, Madras-18, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions of Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment;

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of May, 1978.

[No. S. 35018/82/79-PF. II(i)]

का० आ० 3915.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रक्रीण उपर्युक्त अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, संबद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करते के पश्चात् 1 मई, 1978 से मैसर्स फेडरल इंजीनियर्स, प्लाट नं. ए-81, रोड नं. 16 आ०, बागे इण्डस्ट्रियल इस्टेट थाने-4, जिसके प्रन्तर्गत 53 बी०, इलियट रोड, कलकत्ता-16, स्थित उसकी शाखा भी है, नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनियिष्ट करती है।

[का० सं. 35018/82/79-पी० एफ०-2(ii)]

S.O. 3915.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1962), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of May, 1978 the establishment known as Messrs. Nirlon Synthetic Fibres and Chemicals Limited, Conveyor Belting Division Roha, MIDC Estate, Dhatav, Roha, District Kolaba including its branches at (1), 1, Orient Row, Park Circus, Calcutta, and (2) 115/1-B, Mowbray Road, Madras-18, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35018/82/79-PF. II(ii)]

का० आ० 3916.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स फेडरल इंजीनियर्स, प्लाट नं. ए-81, रोड नं. 16-आ०, बागे इण्डस्ट्रियल इस्टेट थाने-4, जिसके प्रन्तर्गत 53 बी० इलियट रोड, कलकत्ता-16, स्थित उसकी शाखा भी है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों को बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रक्रीण उपर्युक्त अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपर्युक्त उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः यद्यपि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपर्युक्त उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 मई, 1978 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस. 35018/83/79-पी० एफ० 2(i)]

S.O. 3916.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Federal Engineers, Plot No. A-81, Road No. 16-R, Wagle Industrial Estate, Thane-4 including its branch at 53B, Elliott Road, Calcutta-16,

have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of May, 1978.

[No. S. 35018/83/79-PF. II(i)]

का० आ० 3917.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रक्रीण उपर्युक्त अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए संबद्ध विषय में आवश्यक जांच करते के पश्चात् 1 मई, 1978 से मैसर्स फेडरल इंजीनियर्स, प्लाट नं. ए-81, रोड नं. 16 आ०, बागे इण्डस्ट्रियल इस्टेट थाने-4, जिसके प्रन्तर्गत 53 बी०, इलियट रोड, कलकत्ता-16, स्थित उसकी शाखा भी है, नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनियिष्ट करती है।

[का० सं. 35018/83/79-पी० एफ०-2(ii)]

S.O. 3917.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government after making necessary enquiry into the matter hereby specifies with effect from the first day of May, 1978 the establishment known as Messrs, Federal Engineers, Plot No. A-81, Road No. 16-R, Wagle Industrial Estate, Thane-4 including its branch at 53B, Elliot Road, Calcutta-16, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35018/83/79-PF. II(ii)]

का० आ० 3918.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स मूलर इलेक्ट्रिकल एंड इंजीनियरिंग कम्पनी, शंकरभाई कम्पाण्ड (इंडस्ट्री चेम. कम्पाण्ड), आई० बी० पटेल रोड, गोरेगांव (पूर्व), मुम्बई-63, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों को बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रक्रीण उपर्युक्त अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपर्युक्त उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः यद्यपि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपर्युक्त उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 दिसम्बर, 1978 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस. 35018/85/79-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 3918.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Muller Electrical and Engineering Company, Shankarbhaji Compound (Industro Chem. Compound), I. B. Patel Road, Goregaon (East) Bombay-63, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of December, 1978.

[No. S. 35018/85/79-PF. II]

का० आ० 3919.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सुपर-इंजीनियर्स, अमीन इण्डस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, सोनाबाला आम रोड, गोरेगांव (पूर्व), मुम्बई-63, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों को बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रक्रीण उपर्युक्त अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपर्युक्त उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त प्रधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह प्रधिसूचना 1 जनवरी, 1979 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।
[सं. एस० 35018/87/79-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 3919.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Supermech Engineers, Amin Industrial Estate, Sonawala Cross Road, Goragaon (East), Bombay-63, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, 1979.

[No. S. 35018/87/79-PF. II]

का० आ० 3920.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स आइ-डियल रेडू बम्स, मोती उद्योग नगर, प्लॉट नं० 9ए रामचन्द्र लेन, मलाद (पश्चिम), मुम्बई-64, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों को बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध प्रधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त प्रधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह प्रधिसूचना 31 मई, 1978 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस० 35018/91/79-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 3920.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Ideal Rubber Works, Moti Udyog Nagar, Plot No. 9/A, Ramchandra Lane, Malad (West), Bombay-64 have agreed that the provisions of Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty first day of May, 1978.

[No. S. 35018/91/79-PF. II]

का० आ० 3921.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स प्रवीन इंजीनियरिंग एंड प्लास्टिक बम्स, सेक्सरीया इण्डस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, मुम्बई-64, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों को बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त प्रधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह प्रधिसूचना 1 जनवरी, 1978 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।
[सं. एस० 35018/92/79-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 3921.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Pravin Engineering and Plastic Works, Seksarie Industrial Estate, Main Building, Shed No. 5, Chinchodi, S. V. Road, Malad Bombay-64 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act, to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, 1978.

[No. S. 35018(92)/79-PF. II]

का० आ० 3922.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स नोयल फार्मसिटिकल्स, 102 बी-1, पूनम चैम्बर्स, डा० एन्नी बेंगट रोड, वर्ली, मुम्बई-18, नाम स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध प्रधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त प्रधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह प्रधिसूचना 1 प्रगत्त, 1978 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एस० 35018/93/79-पी० एफ० 2(1)]

S.O. 3922.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Noel Pharmaceuticals, 102/B-1, Poonam Chambers, Dr. Annie Besant Road, Worli, Bombay-18, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of August, 1978.

[No. S. 35018/(93)/79-PF. II(1)]

का० आ० 3923.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध प्रधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, संबद्ध विषय में भावशक जांच करने के पश्चात् प्रगत्त, 1978 से मैसर्स नोयल फार्मसिटिकल्स, 102/बी-1 पूनम चैम्बर्स, डा० एन्नी बेंगट रोड, वर्ली, मुम्बई-18, नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोगनां के लिए विनियिष्ट करती है।

[का० सं. एस० 35018/93/79-पी० एफ०-2(2)]

S.O. 3923.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of August, 1978 the establishment known as Messrs. Noel Pharmaceuticals, 102/B-1, Poonam Chambers, Dr. Annie Besant Road, Worli, Bombay-18, for the purpose of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35018(93)/79-PF. II(2)]

का० आ० 3924.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स बालविहार हायर सेकेन्डरी स्कूल, पनरुट्टी (विकास-आर्कोट जिला) नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध प्रधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

प्रतः, अब उक्ता भवित्वियम की घारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त भवित्वियम के उपर्युक्त उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 नियाम, 1977 की प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एम. 35019/125/79-प. एफ. 2]

S.O. 3924.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Bilvihar Higher Secondary School, Panruti (South Arcot District), have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of September, 1977.

[No. S. 35019/125/79-PF. II]

का० आ० 3925.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स दि नियेला कोओपरेटिव सेविंग एंड क्रेडिट सोसाइटी लिमिटेड, आर० सी० चौथे, ब्लॉक म० 24, नई बैली, नामक स्थापन से संबद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों को बहु संख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपर्युक्त उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाएं।

प्रतः, अब, उक्त भवित्वियम की घारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त भवित्वियम के उपर्युक्त उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अप्रैल, 1976 की प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एम. 35019/127/79-पी० एफ. 2(i)]

S.O. 3925.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs The Nirmala Co-operative Saving and Credit Society Limited, R. C. Church, Block No. 24, Nayeli, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April, 1976.

[No. S. 35019/127/79-PF. II(i)]

का० आ० 3926.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपर्युक्त घारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, संबद्ध विवर में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 अप्रैल, 1976 से मैसर्स दि नियेला कोओपरेटिव सेविंग एंड क्रेडिट सोसाइटी लिमिटेड, आर० सी० चौथे, ब्लॉक म० 24, नई बैली, नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुके प्रयोजनों के लिए विनियिट करती है।

[का० सं. एम-35019/127/79-पी० एफ-2 (ii)]

S.O. 3926.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of April, 1976 the establishment known as Messrs. The Nirmala Co-operative Saving and Credit Society Limited, R. C. Church, Block No. 24, Neyveli, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35019/127/79-PF. II(ii)]

का० आ० 3927.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स खेतावत कोक लैन्सिंगरिंग कम्पनी, दूर्दि गोड, डाक घर गोविन्दपुर, जिला धनबाद, बिहार,

नामक स्थापन से संबद्ध विवेचन और कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपर्युक्त भवित्वियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उत्तरांश उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

प्रतः, अब भवित्वियम की घारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त भवित्वियम के उपर्युक्त उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जूनाई, 1979 की प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एम. 35019/187/79-पी० एफ. 2(i)]

S.O. 3927.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Khetawat Coke Manufacturing Company, Tundi Road, Post Office Gobindpur, District Dhanbad (Bihar), have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of July, 1979.

[No. S. 35019/187/79-PF. II(i)]

का० आ० 3928.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपर्युक्त भवित्वियम, (1952-1952 का 19) की घारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक घारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, संबद्ध विवर में आवश्यक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 जूनाई, 1979 से मैसर्स खेतावत कोक लैन्सिंगरिंग कम्पनी, दूर्दि गोड, डाक घर गोविन्दपुर, जिला धनबाद, बिहार,

नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुके प्रयोजनों के लिए विनियिट करती है।

[का० सं. एम-35019/187/79-पी० एफ-2(ii)]

S.O. 3928.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of July, 1979 the establishment known as Messrs. Khetawat Coke Manufacturing Company, Tundi Road, Post Office Gobindpur, District Dhanbad (Bihar), for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35019/187/79-PF. II(ii)]

का० आ० 3929.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स ओरिएण्टल कोक इण्टर्स्ट्रीज, डाक घर गोविन्दपुर जिला धनबाद (बिहार), नामक स्थापन से संबद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुतांश इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपर्युक्त भवित्वियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपर्युक्त उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाएं।

प्रतः, अब उक्त भवित्वियम की घारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त भवित्वियम के उपर्युक्त उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जून, 1979 की प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एम. 35019/191/79-पी० एफ. 2(i)]

S.O. 3929.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Oriental Coke Industries, Post Office Gobindpur District Dhanbad (Bihar), have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of June, 1979.

[No. S. 35019/191/79-PF. II(i)]

का० आ० 3930.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स पी० जी० विजया एसीसीएटेच, क्वार्टर नं० 146, रोड नं०, क 6, डाक घर एच० थैव, कदमा, जमशेदपुर, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहु संख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि 'कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19)' के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 को उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 जून, 1979 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[मं० एम० 35019/196/79-पी० एफ० 2(i)]

S.O. 3930.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs P. G. Vijaya Associated, Quarter No. 146, Road No. 6, Post Office H. Area, Kadma, Jamshedpur, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Fund, and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of June, 1979.

[No. S. 35019/196/79-PF. II(i)]

का० आ० 3931.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, संबद्ध विषय में आवायक जांच करने के पश्चात् 1 जून, 1979 से मैसर्स पी० जी० विजया एसीसीएटेच, क्वार्टर नं०, 146, रोड नं० 6, डाक घर एच० थैव, कदमा, जमशेदपुर, नामक स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनियोजित करती है।

[का० मं० एम०-35019/196/79-पी० एफ०-2(ii)]

S.O. 3931.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of June, 1979 the establishment known as Messrs. P. G. Vijaya Associated Quarter No. 146, Road No. 6, Post Office H. Area, Kadma, Jamshedpur, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35019/196/79-PF. II(ii)]

का० आ० 3932.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स जुबिली एंड एंड कम्पनी, 53, एम० एस० आई० एरिया, पांचवा ब्लॉक, गजारी नगर, बंगलौर-10, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहु संख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि 'कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19)' के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 को उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 मार्च, 1979 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[मं० एम० 35019/197/79-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 3932.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Jubilee Playing Card Company, 53, S. S. 1. Area, 5th Block, Rajajinagar, Bangalore-10, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty first day of March, 1979.

[No. S. 35019/197/79-PF.II]

का० आ० 3933.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि श्री वी० के० सदानन्दन, कन्नूर कैंटर, दि कन्नूर देवन हिल्स क्लब कैंटिन, डाक घर मन्नर, हाई रेंज, केरल, देवी कोलम तालुक, मन्नर ग्राम, इडुक्की जिला, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों को बहु संख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि 'कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19)' के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 को उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 31 जूलाई, 1979 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[मं० एम० 35019/199/79-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 3933.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Shri V. K. Sadanandan, Contractor. The Kannur Devan Hills Club Canteen Post Office Mannar, High Range, Kerala, Devikolam Taluk, Manner Village, Idukki District, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions of Act 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of July, 1979.

[No. S. 35019/199/79-PF. II]

का० आ० 3934.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स माउर्ने क्लान्क इण्डस्ट्रीज, के० रोड, कोट्टायम, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहु संख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है

कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध प्रधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त प्रधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह प्रधिसूचना 31 जूनाई, 1979 को प्रवृत्त होई समझी जाएगी।

[सं. एम. 35019/204/79-पी. 2]

S.O. 3934.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Southern Clock Industries, K. K. Road, Kottayam have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment :

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirty-first day of July, 1979.

[No. S-35019/204/79-PF. II]

का० आ० 3935.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैमर्स सर मावाजीराव डायमंड जुबली एण्ड मेमोरियल ट्रस्ट, फेटेहगंज छाक घर के निकट, बड़ोदा, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों को बहुसंख्या इस बास पर महसून हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध प्रधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः, अब, उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त प्रधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह प्रधिसूचना उम तारीख को प्रवृत्त होगी जिस तारीख को इसे राजपत्र में प्रकाशित किया जाता है।

[सं. एम. 35019/205/79-पी. 2]

S.O. 3935.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Sri Savajirao Diamond Jubilee and Memorial Trust, Near Fatehganj Post Office, Baroda have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall come into force on the date on which it is published in the Official Gazette.

[No. S-35019/205/79-PF. II]

नई दिल्ली, 17 नवम्बर, 1979

का० आ० 3936.—गुजरात राज्य सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा प्रधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के खंड (ष) के अनुसरण में श्री आर० पार्थसारथी के स्थान पर श्री पी० पी० राष्ट्रेन्, मन्त्रिव, गुजरात सरकार स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण विभाग, को कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा नियम में उस राज्य का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है;

अतः, प्रब्र केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा प्रधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के अनुसरण में, भारत सरकार के अम मंत्रालय की प्रधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1517 दिनांक 14 अप्रैल, 1976 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् —

उक्त प्रधिसूचना में, “(राज्य सरकारों द्वारा धारा 4 के खंड (ष) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट)” शीर्षक के नीचे मद. 11 के मामले की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जायेगी, अर्थात् —

“श्री पी० पी० राष्ट्रेन्,

सचिव, गुजरात सरकार,

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण विभाग,

गांधीनगर।”

[सं. आ० 16012/7/76-एच० आई०]

New Delhi, the 17th November, 1979

S.O. 3936.—Whereas the State Government of Gujarat has, in pursuance of Clause (d) of Section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) nominated Shri P. P. Rathod, Secretary to the Government of Gujarat, Health and Family Welfare Department to represent that State on the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, in place of Shri R. Parthasarthy ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1517, dated the 14th April, 1976 namely :-

In the said notification, under the heading “(Nominated by the State Government under clause (d) of section 4)” for the entry against item 11, the following entry shall be substituted, namely :-

“Shri P. P. Rathod, Secretary to the Government of Gujarat, Health and Family Welfare Department Gandhi Nagar.”

[No. U-16012/7/76-HI]

का० आ० 3937.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजसभा (मंड़ के ग्रासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा नियम जो अम मंत्रालय के अधीन एक स्वायत्त सम्पत्ति है, के क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय गुजरात, प्रह्लदाबाद का नाम उक्त उपनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए अधिसूचित करती है।

[संख्या ई-11012/1/78-एच० आई०]

S.O. 3937.—In pursuance of sub-rule 4 of rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the name of the Regional Office, Gujarat, Ahmedabad of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, an autonomous body under the Ministry of Labour, for the purposes of the said sub-rule.

[No. E-11012/1/78-HI]

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1979

का० आ० 3938.—समिल नाडु राज्य सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा प्रधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ष) के अनुसरण में डा० पी० ई० बैन्जामिन के स्थान पर डा० अर्नेस्ट जे० डेविड, निवेशक, चिकित्सा सेवायें तथा परिवार कल्याण, तमिल-नाडु सरकार को चिकित्सा प्रसुविधा परिषद् में उस राज्य से प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है;

अतः, अब केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के अनुमरण में, भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की प्रधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 2980, दिनांक 26 जुलाई, 1976 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त प्रधिसूचना में “(संवर्धित राज्य सरकारों द्वारा धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (अ) के प्रथीन नामसंविष्ट)”, शीर्षक के नीचे भव 20 के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात्:—

“दा० अर्नेस्ट जे० डेविड,
निवेशक,
चिकित्सा सेवाएँ सथा परिवार कल्याण,
तमिलनाडू, मद्रास १”

[मा० पू-16012/17/76-एस० आई०]

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1979

S.O. 3938.—Whereas the State Government of Tamil Nadu has, in pursuance of clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) nominated Dr. Ernest J. David, Director of Medical Services and Family Welfare, Government of Tamil Nadu to represent that State on the Medical Benefit council in place of Dr. P. E. Benjamin;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S. O. 2980, dated the 26th July, 1976, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading “(nominated by the State Governments concerned under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10)”, for the entry against item 20, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“Dr. Ernest J. David,
Director of Medical Services and
Family Welfare,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
MADRAS.”

[No. U-16012/17/76-HI]

का० आ० 3939.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 1 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शाकित्यों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एवं धारा 2 विसम्बार, 1979 की उस नारीख के रूप में नियन्त करती है, जिसकी उक्त प्रधिनियम के प्रध्याय 4 (धारा 44 और 45) के मिकाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) और प्रध्याय 5 और 6 (धारा 76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा 77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिकाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) के उपबंध केरल राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्र में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात्:—

“जिला कोट्टायाम के
भीनाचल तालुक में
राजस्वप्राम कनाकरी के
प्रत्यंगत आने वाले क्षेत्र।”

[संख्या एस-38013/15/79-एस आई०]
हमराज छाबड़ा, उप सचिव

S.O. 3939.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 2nd December, 1979 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI (except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the

said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Kerala, namely:—

“The areas within the revenue village of Kanakkari in the Meenachal and Taluk of Kottayam District.”

[No. S-38013/15/79-HI]

HANS RAJ CHHABRA, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 16th November, 1979

S.O. 3940.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Oil India Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 3rd November, 1979.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL : CALCUTTA

Reference No. 34 of 1978

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs Oil India Co., Ltd., Duliajan Assam.

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers—Shri J. P. Bhattacharyya, Sr. Advocate, with Sri P. C. Deka, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Sri J. Datta Gupta, Advocate.

STATE : Assam

Industry : Oil

AWARD

By Order No. L-30012(6)|76-D.IV(B)|D.JII.B dated 3|4th April, 1978, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, referred an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the Management of M/s Oil India Co. Ltd., Duliajan, Assam and their workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication. The Schedule to the order of reference reads :—

“Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Oil India Limited, Duliajan, Assam in dismissing Shri Muhibdar Phukan, Regd. No. 9/1432; Light Vehicle Driver w.e.f. 21-5-73 is justified and if not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. On April 20, 1973 at 9.45 a.m. Sri Muhibdar Phukan the concerned workman, a driver, was charged by a chargesheet under Section XIV (2)(ix) of the management's Standing Orders with having at about 6.20 a.m. on 20th April, 1973 committed an offence by showing disorderly behaviour during working hours in that he abused and assaulted Sri A. K. Agarwal, E.I.C. Transport Depot, in the office of the Head clerk. It was stated in the chargesheet that an enquiry into the matter was to be held in the office of the Transport department at 8 a.m. on April 21, 1973. It was further recorded that the concerned workman had cited Sri Madhusudan Tewari as witness at the enquiry and he had requested his co-employee Sri B. R. Gohain to represent him. It was recorded that the chargesheet was read out to the accused, its contents explained, and handed over to him at 9.45 a.m. on 20th April, 1973. The chargesheet has been made Ext. W-1.

3. It transpires that subsequently at the request of the concerned workman the Enquiry Officer permitted Sri Rajan Baruah, the President of the Union, to represent him in place of Sri Madhusudan Tewari.

4. By a letter dated 20th April 1973 the Chief Engineer of Oil India Limited appointed Sri M. Gaznavi as the Enquiry Officer to enquire into the charge, Ext. M-6. The enquiry was held on 21st April, 1973. Thereafter hearing was

adjourned to 23rd April, 1973. Thereafter the enquiry continued upto 25th April, 1973. The entire proceedings of the enquiry have been tendered and marked Ext. M-3. On behalf of the management, the complainant Sri A. K. Agarwal, G.S. Gogoi and Sri Phulelswar Barua deposed before the Enquiry Officer. On behalf of the concerned workman, Sri Muhibdar Phukan himself, M. Tewari and Ranjan Roy gave evidence. It appears from the records that two neutral observers were present throughout the proceedings and so were the concerned workman and his representative Sri Rajan Barua. The management's witnesses, particularly Sri Agarwal, were cross-examined more than once by the concerned workman himself as well as by his representative Sri Baruah. There is evidence that Sri Baruah, the President of Union had some education.

5. On May 3, 1973 the Enquiry Officer made his report and gave his findings and forwarded the same to the Chief Engineer, (Fields). In the concluding paragraph of his report he stated that he was satisfied that the charge had been fully established. Thereafter by an order dated May 16, 1973 Sri V. A. Patel, Transport Superintendent dismissed the concerned workman from service with effect from 21st May, 1973 under the relevant provision of the company's standing orders.

6. The concerned workman preferred an appeal to the Labour Superintendent Ext. W-3. By an order dated June 19, 1973 the appeal was dismissed. A further appeal was preferred by the concerned workman to the Resident Chief Executive. That appeal was also dismissed by an order dated 27th September, 1973, Ext. M-13.

7. The management duly made an application under Sec. 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for approval of the order of dismissal in Case No. 24 of 1973 before the Industrial Tribunal of Assam at Dibrugarh. By an order dated September 26, 1975 the Tribunal accorded its approval to the action taken by the management, Ext. M-9.

8. The present reference is directed against the order of dismissal of the concerned workman. The preliminary question which has to be decided is whether the enquiry was fairly and properly held and whether the findings of the Enquiry Officer are supported by evidence. Learned advocates appearing on behalf of the parties made a request to the Tribunal to hear arguments on the question of the propriety of the punishment in the event it was found that the enquiry was fair and the findings were justified. The management also made an application for taking fresh evidence in case it transpires that the enquiry invalid and the findings of the Enquiry Officer are set aside. I gave leave to the learned advocates to argue on the propriety of the punishment imposed by the management, should it be found by the Tribunal that the enquiry was properly conducted and the findings of the Enquiry Officer were justified.

9. The validity of the enquiry proceedings and the findings of the Enquiry Officer have been assailed on many grounds. A submission was made that the enquiry was held hastily, thereby denying the concerned workman a proper opportunity to organise his defence. The chargesheet was served on 20th April, 1973 early in the morning. By that time the concerned workman had cited his witness and intimated to the management who was to represent him at the enquiry. He never complained before the Enquiry Officer that he did not have enough time to take steps for his defence. He was ably assisted by the President of the Union himself. The charge was one of abuse and assault. It did not involve any examination of documents. It was merely a case of adducing oral evidence by those who had any knowledge of the facts. On April 21, 1973, the first date of hearing, questions were put to the complainant and his witnesses and to the concerned workman by the Enquiry Officer. There was no cross-examination. The hearing was then adjourned to 23rd April, 1973. The concerned workman therefore had time to prepare his defence, if any further preparation was necessary. Moreover, it appears from the records that the Enquiry Officer gave repeated opportunities to cross-examine the witnesses. In fact, cross-examination of almost every witness produced on behalf of the management was held more than once by the concerned workman himself as well as by his representative on different dates. The Enquiry Officer appears to have been very liberal in acceding to requests for

repeated cross-examination. In these circumstances I am of opinion that there is no substance in the objection that the concerned workman did not enough time to prepare his defence.

10. It was then submitted that the concerned workman did not have a chance to submit an explanation prior to the issue of the chargesheet. It was argued that under clause XIV(2)(i) of the company's standing orders such a course was mandatory. The relevant clause reads as follows :

'No punishment may be awarded unless the workman concerned has been informed in writing of the alleged misconduct and has been given an opportunity to explain the circumstances alleged against him. At the departmental enquiry the workman concerned may call a co-worker of his choice to represent him.'

It is crystal clear that the clause does not require the management to ask for an explanation from a delinquent workman prior to issue of a chargesheet or the departmental enquiry. In the case of 'The Superintendent, Kallayar Estate and O. Kuriakko, 1971 (I) L.J., p. 83, the High Court of Kerala held that there is no substance in the objection that no opportunity was given to the worker to submit an explanation as to why action should not be taken against him, before the enquiry was started. There is no statutory provision that a delinquent worker should be given an opportunity prior to the enquiry to explain why an enquiry in respect of the charge should not be conducted against him. All he is entitled to have is that he should be given sufficient notice of the charges against him and of the allegations on which the charges are based and a fair and reasonable opportunity to meet the charges. The same view was taken by the Karnataka High Court in Motor Industries Co. Ltd., vs. R. Adinarayananappa, 1978 (I) L.J., p. 443. Learned advocate appearing on behalf of the concerned workman relied on a chargesheet served on a workman on 6-12-78 where an opportunity was given to submit a written explanation within 24 hours as to why appropriate disciplinary action should not be taken against him and he submitted an explanation Exts. W-6 and W-7. On that occasion, before issuing the charge-sheet the management asked for explanation. That however does not mean that this must be done in every case. So long as the workman has adequate opportunities to defend himself and submit his explanation oral or in writing at the enquiry, it is a matter of no consequence whether a prior opportunity is given to him to explain his conduct. In the absence of any such provision in the standing orders, I am of opinion that the proposition that prior to the enquiry it is necessary to give the chargedsheeted workman an opportunity to submit an explanation is not tenable.

11. I may go into the evidence adduced in this case. On 20th April, 1973 a complaint in writing appears to have been made by Sri A.K. Agarwal to the Transport Superintendent. The complaint was as follows :

"T.S.

20-4-73

This is to inform you that Shri Muhibdar Phukan, Regd. No. 9/1432 came to my Office this morning at about 6.15 a.m. and enquired why he failed in the Fitter's Test, I explained to him that he did not do well. Then he accused me of bribery and unfairness. I told Shri Phukan that if he had anything further regarding the test, he should complain to T. S. or L.S. Then as I entered our Head Clerk's Office, Shri Phukan followed me, abused and assaulted me by giving a blow on my left jaw. Shri Phulelswar Baruah, Regd. No. 9/2903 who was nearby caught hold of Shri Phukan and took him out. Our Head Clerk Shri G.S. Gogoi was also present. This is for your information and necessary action.

Sd/- A. K. AGARWAL
EIC[TD.]

This document appears to have been in the file of the Enquiry Officer but was not made an exhibit nor was it referred to in his Report except that it was mentioned as a document which was returned to the Chief Engineer along with the Enquiry Report. It was only at the hearing of his reference that this document has been made an exhibit and marked Ext. M-2.

12. In his evidence before the Enquiry Officer Sri Agarwal repeated what he had stated in the complaint, with a little elaboration. He said that Sri Phukan accused him of unfairness and taking bribes. He told Sri Phukan that if he had any complaint regarding the method of testing he should make his complaint to T.S. and L.S. Then he went to the Head clerk's office and Sri Phukan followed him. In the Head clerk's office he abused him and assaulted him by giving a blow on his left jaw. During this time the Head Clerk, G. S. Gogoi and others were present. Then Sri Phuleswar Barua subdued Sri Phukan and took him out. He reported the incident to the Transport Superintendent.

13. Sri G. S. Gogoi stated that Sri Agarwal entered his office and gave him a letter. At that time Sri Phukan also entered the office. Then Sri Agarwal told him that if Shri Phukan had any complaint he should be asked to go to T.S. Then Sri Phukan said to Agarwal "what sort of Officer you are I." He repeated those words raising his hands and he said "why did you touch my body with your hand"? He chased Sri Agarwal and hit him with a blow on his left jaw. Then Phuleswar Barua caught hold of Sri Phukan and took him out of the office. It may be stated that in his cross-examination, Gogoi said that Sri Agarwal protested and said "I have not touched you. Why you are telling a lie?" Sri Gogoi also stated in his evidence that Sri Agarwal entered his office first and Shri Phukan came after him. He also said that he had not seen Sri Agarwal touching Sri Phukan's body and it was Sri Phukan who touched Sri Agarwal's body. In cross-examination he said it was not true that Sri Phukan went to Sri Agarwal's office and Agarwal slapped him on his neck and pushed him out of his office. This charge made by Sri Phukan was denied by Sri Gogoi. It has however to be borne in mind in this context that Sri Gogoi was not present in Agarwal's office when Agarwal is alleged to have slapped Shri Phukan and pushed him out of his office. Therefore he was not in a position to verify or deny the occurrence of that incident. It was Sri Gogoi's evidence that Sri Agarwal entered his office not only to give him a letter but also to tell Sri Phukan that if he had any complaint he should see the T.S.

14. The only other witness who deposed on behalf of the management was Sri Phuleswar Barua, a Driver. He said he was talking to G. S. Gogoi, the Head Clerk. At that time he saw Sri Agarwal and Sri Phukan entering the room. They were arguing. When he saw them both engaged in an altercation and the tempers were rising he took Sri Phukan out of the room. His evidence was that he did not see anybody laying hand on the other.

15. Sri Muhidhar Phukan the concerned workman stated in his evidence that he argued with Sri Agarwal but he did not assault him. He asked him if he could know the reasons why he failed in the test. He told Sri Agarwal that a senior man like him should have been considered as qualified. He also told him that one new man Sri Baldeo Singh had passed the test. Then Sri Agarwal angrily stated, "I have worked in many places and I know all the laws". Agarwal abused him and then pushed him out and slapped him and asked him to go to T.S. Then he went to Gogoi's room and told Sri Gogoi that he had seen such officers and when he was about to tell him that Sri Agarwal pushed him out and slapped him. Sri Agarwal entered the room and he and Agarwal had arguments. Then Sri Phuleswar Barua took him out of the room of Sri Gogoi.

16. At the hearing of the reference a document, dated 20th April, 1973 signed by the concerned workman was tendered and made a formal exhibit, Ext.W-8. It is a complaint by the concerned workman addressed to the Labour Superintendent. On behalf of the management it was denied that any such complaint was received. There the concerned workman says, "This morning I met Mr. Agarwal, CJE, Transport Department, to enquire about the result of test interview in which I appeared a few days back. But it is unfortunate that right in the morning he received me with most ill treatment. Moreover, I was assaulted by him in his office premises. Sri Madhusudan Tewari was present at the time of incident."

17. Sri Madhusudan Tewari who was produced by the concerned workman deposed at the enquiry. He said that while going from the office of Sri Mishra through the Office corridor, he found that the door of Sri Agarwal's office was closed and inside the room Sri Agarwal and Sri Phukan were

talking. They were talking in a high tone. Opening the door both of them came out. He did not see anything more. In answer to a question put to him by Sri R. Barua he said he had not seen Sri Agarwal pushing out Sri Phukan out of his room.

18. Sri Ranjan Roy who deposed on behalf of the concerned workman stated that on the relevant date at about 6.15 a.m. he was going from the washing ramp towards the office. He was standing near the hanger in front of Sri Agarwal's office. From there he could see a side of Sri Phukan who was standing inside Sri Agarwal's office about 2 ft. inside away from the door. He saw Sri Agarwal pushing away Sri Phukan and opening the door and then both of them left the room. The reason he gave for coming to the office was that he did so to enquire about a bicycle loan. He was standing at a distance of 12 to 13 ft. from Agarwal's room. He stated that prior to Sri Agarwal and Shri Phukan coming out of the room, the door was closed.

19. Two questions arise in this case. The main question is whether the concerned workman abused and assaulted Sri Agarwal. The subsidiary question is whether Agarwal slapped him and pushed him out of his office. The Enquiry Officer appears to have accepted the evidence of Sri Agarwal and Sri Gogoi. Gogoi's evidence is that Sri Agarwal came to see him with a paper and also to tell Phukan that if he had any grievance he should address him to T.S. or L.S. After he entered Gogoi's office Phukan followed him. Phukan did not have any business to see Gogoi. He appears to have entered Gogoi's office in a state of excitement and with the intention of settling the score with Sri Agarwal. Phukan's case was that he entered first and Sri Agarwal came after him. I do not see any particular reason why Sri Phukan should have entered Sri Gogoi's office except for the reason I have suggested. On a careful consideration of the entire case, I am of opinion that the Enquiry Officer was right in his conclusion. Sri Phuleswar Barua stated that he did not see anybody laying hand on the other. It seems to me that Sri Barnah was anxious not to displease his colleague Sri Phukan. As regards Shri Phukan who denied that he had assaulted Shri Agarwal in Gogoi's office, I do not believe him because in the general context of the evidence he does not appear to have given his evidence truthfully. Tewari, the only witness he cited in the chargesheet and in his complaint, has denied the allegation made by him against Agarwal.

20. On the question as to whether Sri Agarwal slapped Phukan and pushed him out of his office, I have no hesitation in answering the question in the negative. Tewari in his evidence roundly denied that he had seen Agarwal slapping Phukan or pushing him out of the office. I disbelieve Ranjan Roy's evidence that he saw Agarwal pushing Phukan out of his room. If the door was closed at the material time, as he says it was, I do not understand how he could have seen any part of Phukan's body from outside. In dismissing the case of Sri Phukan that he was slapped and pushed out by Sri Agarwal, I have taken into consideration the important fact that neither Sri Phukan nor the Union President Sri Barnah who cross-examined Agarwal suggested in course of cross-examination of Sri Agarwal that Sri Agarwal had done any such thing.

21. On the basis of the evidence on record, I am therefore of opinion that the charge against the concerned workman has been established and the allegation that Sri Agarwal slapped him or pushed him out has not been substantiated.

22. A submission was made that the enquiry proceedings have been vitiated by reason of the Enquiry Officer refusing to accord permission to the concerned workman and his representative to examine one Sri Das of Electrical Department on the ground that his evidence could not have any relevance. Sri Ranjan Roy in answer to a question put to him by Sri R. Barua stated that he had heard that one Das visited Agarwal on some occasion. Then there was a certain altercation between them. Sri Agarwal pointed his rifle at Das who ran away. He said he had only heard of this incident. Phukan wanted to establish this fact by summoning Das to give evidence. Sri R. Barua the representative of the concerned workman stated that he wanted to produce Das to establish by evidence the nature and behaviour of Sri Agarwal towards workman. This he proposed to do to establish that Phukan did not hit Agarwal but Agarwal hit Phukan. It is quite clear that Das had no knowledge of the facts of the case and any evidence that he might have given

could have no relevance. He could have of course given what is often described as character evidence. One swallow does not make a summer nor does loss of temper on one occasion prove loss of temper on all occasions. Even then, for argument's sake even if it is assumed that Sri Agarwal was a man of violent temper, by itself it can hardly lead to the conclusion that the charge brought by him against the concerned workman was false. A man of violent temper may well become a victim of an assault. The only question on which violent temper of Agarwal could have been relevant is whether he slapped Phukan and pushed him out of his office. On that question the evidence of Tewari seems to me to be conclusive or nearly conclusive. For these reasons, I do not think that the concerned workman has suffered any prejudice by not having been able to adduce any character evidence through Sri Das and therefore I rule out the objection.

23. It was submitted on behalf of the concerned workman that the Enquiry Officer took into consideration the complaint of Sri Agarwal made to the T.S. in writing, Ext. M-2, although it was not shown to the concerned workman nor was any question asked in course of evidence on that document. The Enquiry Officer in his evidence has denied that he took this complaint into consideration in writing his Report. He merely returned it as it came to him along with the chargesheet as will appear from the Enquiry Report itself. I do not see any reason why I should not accept the evidence of the Enquiry Officer on this point. Moreover, there is nothing in Ext. M-2 which Sri Agarwal did not state in his oral evidence. The concerned workman could not therefore have been prejudiced by non-production of Ext. M-2 at the enquiry.

24. Objection was raised to the procedure adopted by the Enquiry Officer in taking the evidence in-chief of the witnesses one after another and then taking their evidence in cross-examination. A submission was also made that witnesses were not examined in proper order. No objection was raised on behalf of the concerned workmen at the hearing, to this procedure. The Enquiry Officer gave more than one opportunity to the concerned workman and his representative to cross-examine the witnesses. Learned advocate appearing on behalf of the concerned workman could not explain how his client has been prejudiced by the procedure adopted by the Enquiry Officer.

25. It was then argued that the evidence was not explained to the concerned workman. It is true that in the records of the evidence it is not stated that the depositions were explained. The Enquiry Officer, has, however, stated in his evidence before the Tribunal that the depositions were properly explained in Assamese and the concerned workman was present throughout the proceedings. The concerned workman has also in his evidence before the Tribunal stated that he does not remember whether the evidence was explained to him in some language other than English.

26. It was submitted on behalf of the concerned workman that the Enquiry Officer in his Report has not discussed the evidence given on behalf of the concerned workman nor has he given reasons for his findings and therefore he does not appear to have applied his mind properly. The Report is brief and cryptic. I have however gone into the evidence myself and on my assessment of the evidence, I agree with the conclusions of the Enquiry Officer and his findings.

27. A point was argued on the competence of the Transport Superintendent to pass the order of dismissal. There is no substance in this contention. Under Clause XIV(2)(2), it is for the departmental officer to award punishment. From the evidence given before the Tribunal by Sri Anand Bez Baruah, Sri Bhupan Barua and also the Enquiry Officer it transpires that the Transport Superintendent is the Head of the Transport department. It is therefore quite clear that the punishment has been awarded by the person competent to do so under the Standing Orders.

28. It was then contended that the Transport Superintendent having issued the chargesheet should not have awarded the punishment. Learned advocate appearing on behalf of the concerned workman could not satisfy me that this could not be done under the relevant Standing Orders. Moreover, on general principles I do not see why this could not be done. This objection does not seem to me to be tenable.

29. Lastly, an objection was raised on the ground that the Transport Superintendent in awarding punishment did not take into consideration the previous record, if any, of the concerned workman and any extenuating or aggravating circumstances. In fact, in the order of punishment, Ext. M-5, it was stated that in view of the gravity of the misconduct and in the absence of any extenuating circumstances, the concerned workman was dismissed from service with effect from 21st May, 1973 in terms of the relevant provisions of the Company's Standing Orders. Learned advocate appearing on behalf of the concerned workman submitted that the mere fact that the workman had been in service for a long period of time is by itself an extenuating circumstance, to which I do not agree and the absence of any blemish in his record is, by itself, evidence of good conduct to which I agree. The question however is whether the Transport Superintendent did take into consideration all these factors in awarding punishment as prescribed by the Standing Orders. In the order of punishment, he recorded that he did so. I am therefore, unable to uphold this objection.

30. On the question of punishment, I am unable to interfere with the order of punishment having regard to the nature of the misconduct committed by the concerned workman. The offence is grave and subversive of all discipline. I cannot therefore hold that the extreme punishment of dismissal awarded in this case is not justified.

31. In the view I have taken, I hold that the action of the management of Messrs Oil India Limited, Daulatganj, Assam in dismissing Sri Muhibdar Phukan, Regd. No. 9/1432, Light Vehicle Driver with effect from 21st May, 1973 is justified. The concerned workman is not therefore entitled to any relief.

Sd/-

S. K. MUKHERJEA, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-30012/6/76-D.IV.B[D.III.B]

A. K. ROY, Under Secy.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 26th October, 1979.

New Delhi, the 17th November, 1979

S.O. 3941.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Calcutta in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Allahabad Bank Calcutta and their workmen over treating Shri Hari Nath Kapoor, General Secretary of Allahabad Bank Cash Staff Association as on casual leave on 18th, 19th May, 28th June, 1976 and thereafter also while attending conciliation/adjudication before the authorities.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL :
CALCUTTA**

Reference No. 10 of 1978

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Allahabad Bank, Calcutta,

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers.—Shri M. R. Sarbadhikary, Law Officer.

On behalf of Workmen.—Shri A. D. Singh, President, Allahabad Bank Cash Staff Association.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Banking

AWARD

By Order No. L-12011/23/77-D. II. A, dated 9th September, 1977, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, referred an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation

to the Allahabad Bank, Calcutta and their workmen, to this tribunal, for adjudication. The Schedule to the order of reference reads as :

"Whether the management is relation to Allahabad Bank, Regional Office, Calcutta are justified in treating Shri Hari Nath Kapoor, General Secretary of Allahabad Bank Cash Staff Association as on casual leave on 18th, 19th May, 28th June, 1976 and thereafter also while attending conciliation/adjudication before the authorities ? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled ?"

2. On 18th, 19th May and on 28th June, 1976 the concerned workman Sri Hari Nath Kapoor, General Secretary of Allahabad Bank Cash Staff Association, attended certain conciliation/adjudication proceedings before the authorities. He was absent from office on these occasions. The management of the bank declined to treat him as on duty. In fact, by a letter dated 21st June, 1976, Ext. M-1, the management intimated to him that under instructions from the Regional Office the management had decided to treat his absence on 18th and 19th May, 1976 for attending the office of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal at Calcutta as two days' casual/privilege leave against his entitlement. The concerned workman has filed certain letters before the Tribunal dated 23rd November, 1971, Ext. W-16, 21st March, 1975, Ext. W-17, 29th April, 1975, Ext. W-18, 19th August, 1975, Ext. W-19 and a letter dated 25th August, 1975 Ext. W-20 requesting the management to release him. No reply was received to those requests.

3. The case as pleaded by the concerned workman in its written statement is that the Allahabad Bank Cash Staff Association of which he is the General Secretary came into existence in the month of August, 1971. The management of Allahabad Bank treated him as on duty leave while and whenever required to attend conciliation proceedings before the Conciliation Officer. He was also treated as on duty leave when he attended the adjudication proceedings before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal at Calcutta. The management suddenly ceased to treat him as on duty leave with effect from 18th May, 1976. The curtailment of the said facility is violative of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act.

4. It is also contended that the management extended the said facilities to the office-bearers of other unions, and he, as the General Secretary of the Allahabad Bank Cash Staff Association, was being discriminated against.

5. The management in their written statement denied the allegation that the absence of the General Secretary of the Association from duty to attend conciliation proceedings or adjudication before the Industrial Tribunal has been treated as duty leave. The Bank categorically denied the allegation that the concerned workman was sanctioned any duty leave on certain specific days or at all. The Bank, however, admitted that the concerned workman as the General Secretary of the Association was allowed to take "off" while on duty on his request depending on the exigencies of work as is allowed to other workmen of the Bank. The various leave facilities provided in the Bank are being regulated and governed by terms and conditions as per Leave Rules incorporated in the Bipartite Settlement dated 19-10-66 and the said terms and conditions are binding on the concerned workman as General Secretary of the Association. There is no provision for allowing special leave to workmen, staff/union representative to attend conciliation proceedings or Industrial Tribunal wherein the proceedings/cases are initiated at their instance. The Bank took two preliminary objections at the hearing, one of which was pleaded and the other was not. It was pleaded that the terms of reference do not fall within the ambit of industrial dispute as defined in Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and as such the Tribunal is not competent to adjudicate upon the terms of reference. This objection was not pressed at the hearing. As it raises a question of jurisdiction I may point out that the ambit of Section 2(k) is wide enough to cover the present reference. The other objection related to the locus standi of the union to sponsor the dispute on the ground that it was not sufficiently representative in character. As this objection was not pleaded or taken by way of a preliminary objection in the proper stage, I did not permit the management to press it. I ought to add that the representative of the management was lukewarm in raising this objection.

6. Sri Hari Nath Kapoor, the concerned workman, deposed before the Tribunal. He relied on the records of the Assistant Labour Commissioner's file No. ALC-II/1D(146)/75. It appears that he attended conciliation proceedings at the A.L.C.'s office in connection with one case on 25-3-75 at 11 A.M., 5th April, 1975 at 11 a.m., 14th April, 1975 at 2 p.m., 21st July, 1975 at 11 a.m., 29th July, 1975 and 30th July, 1975. The file was marked Ext. W-13 by consent. He said he was engaged before the Conciliation Officer sometimes for half an hour, sometimes for one hour and sometimes for two hours. He said that he has been in the employment of Allahabad Bank for 21 years. He was one of the Vice-Presidents of Allahabad Bank Indian Staff Association. He said that when a representative of the union attended conciliation proceedings he was granted leave. No pay was deducted for such leave nor was it adjusted against other-leave. The union of which was a member at the material time came into existence in November, 1971. His case is that prior to 18th May, 1976 he was granted leave for attending conciliation proceedings. Every time he applied in writing for permission to attend conciliation proceedings, permission was granted. He did not apply for any leave nor was any leave granted to him. The time he was absent from office in connection with the conciliation proceedings was treated by the Bank as a period of duty. The representative of other unions are released to attend conciliation proceedings without loss of leave. In cross-examination he admitted that the management never gave him permission in writing to attend conciliation proceedings. For attending conciliation proceedings on 18th, 19th May, 1976 he was granted casual/privilege leave against his entitlement. That will appear from Ext. M-1. On 16th June, 1976 one Manick Ranjan Chakravorty and one Sourin Sinha were granted special leave to enable them to attend conciliation proceedings on that day. He admitted that he had never been granted any special leave by the management in the past. He did not agree that it is not the practice of the bank to grant special leave to employees for attending conciliation proceedings, Labour Courts and Tribunals. It appears from a note-sheet of the Conciliation Officer which has been made Ext. W-14 that one Manick Ranjan Chakravorty and Sourin Sinha, General Secretary and President respectively, of a Trade Union of Allahabad Bank attended conciliation proceedings on 16th June, 1976, 21st December, 1976 and 5th January, 1977. In the Attendance register of the Bank for the relevant periods they were recorded to have been present, Ext. W-1, W-2 and W-5. Similarly, the concerned workman who, as appears from the notesheet of the Conciliation Officer, Ext. W-13, attended conciliation proceedings on 28th May, 1975, 5th April, 1975, 14th April, 1975, 30th April, 1975 and 20th May, 1975 was shown as present in the relevant attendance register of the Bank, Exts. W-10 and W-11. It may be stated that in the attendance register the words 'RLC' appear against the name of the concerned workman with regard to 25th March, 5th April and 14th April, 1975. It also appears from the attendance register that on 26th May, 1972 he was treated as present although there is a note in the register that he attended the High Court and the Regional Labour Commissioner's office. A Memorandum of Settlement by which certain disputes were adjusted between the management and the Union on 17th December, 1974 has been made Ext. W-15. From that document it appears that the concerned workman was present before the Conciliation Officer on 17th December, 1974. It may be pointed out that in the Attendance Register he is shown as present on duty, Ext. W-9.

7. It is quite clear from the records that as between the rival contentions, truth lies somewhere in the middle. On many occasions the management ignored absence from office duty on the part of Union Secretaries or Presidents when they were required to attend conciliation proceedings. It does not necessarily follow that the management did so on all occasions. The absence from duty might have been for a short-time or even for the whole day. At least in some cases, as I have said, the Bank did not take notice of it. It is not possible to ascertain from the records what was the duration of the absence on the part of Union officers. It is quite clear that the Bank did not grant any permission in writing to any Union officer to attend conciliation proceedings or Industrial Tribunal nor did the Bank grant any special leave to anyone on this score. The question is however one of entitlement or, in other words, whether the concerned workman was entitled as a matter of right to be treated as on duty on 18th and 19th May and 28th June, 1976 when he was absent on the ground that he had to attend conciliation or adjudication proceedings.

8. Shri M. R. Sarbadhikari, appearing on behalf of the management, pointed out that in the Bipartite Settlement of 1966 as modified from time to time which is admittedly binding on the parties to this reference, specific provisions have been made for grant of special leave in Chapter X, paragraph 13.39. These provisions relate to grant of special leave to certain employees for attending meetings and conferences of trade unions of Bank employees. They do not provide for any special leave to enable office-bearers of trade unions to attend conciliation proceedings or Tribunals. They provide for special leave upto a prescribed ceiling for office-bearers and committee members of certain trade unions. It has also been provided in paragraph 13.40 that an employee on special leave shall be entitled to pay and allowances as if he was on duty.

9. Shri Sarbadhikari relied on a decision of the Supreme Court in Indian Oxygen Ltd. and Their Workmen, 1969 I LLJ, 235. In that case there was a demand that union representatives should be allowed special leave to attend Law courts for matters connected with the workers and the management, to attend annual functions of their Federations, to attend Executive Committee meetings of the Unions, Federations and Conventions of Central Organisations i.e. Indian National Trade Union Congress. It appears from the report of the judgment that in that case the appellant company had been allowing those of its workmen who were Union representatives to attend without loss of pay proceedings before Conciliation Officers and Industrial Tribunals. The Court observed that it was fair because conciliation proceedings are likely to get thwarted if the workers' representatives are not there to discuss the dispute and put forward their views and wherever possible to arrive at a settlement or compromise. Over and above that facility the workmen get various types of paid leave. The Court observed :

"It is impossible to say that the leave granted by the company will full pay is not fair or even liberal. In conceding the demand of the union the tribunal does not appear to have considered the adverse effect on the company's production if further absenteeism were to be allowed especially when the crying need of the country's economy is more and more production and employers are exhorted to streamline their management to achieve this objective and to bring down their cost in line with international cost. In awarding this demand the tribunal also did not specify on how many occasions the executive committee meetings of the union and other meetings would be held when the company would be obliged to give special leave with pay to the union's representatives. Similarly, there is no knowing how many delegates the union would send to attend the conventions of the federation and the Indian National Trade Union Congress. The tribunal could not, in the very nature of things, specify or limit not, in the very nature of things, specify or limit the number of such meetings, for such an attempt would amount to interference in the administration of the union and its autonomy. Its order must, of necessity, therefore, have to be indefinite with the result that the appellant-company would not know beforehand on how many occasions and to how many of its workmen it would be called upon to grant special leave. Further, in case there are more than one union in the company's establishment, the representatives of all such unions would also have to be given such leave to attend the aforesaid meetings."

10. In paragraph 471 of the Sastry award which has been incorporated in terms in the Bipartite Settlement, with its subsequent modification, it is stated as follows :

"471. Before we proceed to frame a set of leave rules for the banking industry under reference before us we shall dispose of those demands which appear to us to be high-pitched. A new species of leave called "special leave" has been demanded for office bearers of unions and associations to carry out their trade union functions, duties and activities. Some of them have to attend proceedings of labour courts and tribunals and take part in the conference of trade unions. The banks have tried to repel the demand on the ground that these activities cannot be carried on at the expense of their duties. We are of opinion that no case has been made out for "special

leave". Legitimate trade union activity should be conducted out of office hours and without detriment to the interests of the bank. As regards leave for attending labour courts or tribunals, it is unnecessary to give any direction as ordinarily the court or tribunal would be in a position to give appropriate direction in respect of this demand as and when necessary."

11. Sri A. D. Singh, appearing on behalf of the Union pointed out that an Industrial Tribunal can create new rights and relied on decisions reported in AIR 1957 S.C. p. 276 and AIR 1959 SC 1035. The proposition need not be disputed. That however does not mean that the tribunal has an unfettered power to create new rights and impose new obligations: In Grindlays Bank Ltd. v. Central Government Industrial Tribunal, 1978, II LLJ, p. 462, a decision of the Calcutta High Court, Sabyasachi Mukherji, J, said :

"In A.I.R. 1961 S.C. 867, where at page 870 the Supreme Court, after reviewing the various points observed that there was no doubt, therefore, that it was open to an Industrial Court in an appropriate case to impose new obligations on the parties before it or modify contracts in the interest of industrial peace or give awards which might have the effect of extending existing agreement or making a new one. But the Supreme Court cautioned that, however, did not mean that an Industrial Court could do anything and everything when dealing with an industrial dispute. This power was conditioned by the subject-matter with which it was dealing and also by the existing industrial law and it would not be open to it while dealing with a particular matter before it to overlook the industrial law relating to that matter and laid down by the Legislature or by the Court."

The Bipartite Settlement which is binding on almost all the Banking companies and their workmen, the ambit of which is very wide, if not exhaustive, does not provide for the contingency of granting special leave to enable union officers to attend conciliation proceedings or industrial adjudication before Courts and Tribunals. The Sastry award or the Desai award have also refrained from making any such provision. In any event, in my opinion, even if it is felt that provisions for special leave is called for to enable trade union officers to attend conciliation proceedings and industrial adjudication, the matter should be dealt with at the national level and suitable limits to the period of special leave and occasions for such leave will have to be prescribed. At present the managements of Banks, at their discretion, treat absence from duty on the ground of attending conciliation and adjudication proceedings as period spent on 'duty' by ignoring such absence or by granting permission express or implied to do so. Until the matter is dealt with at the national level, and a decision is taken to make provisions in that regard if found necessary, I do not think it would be advisable to interfere with the present practice especially when there is nothing in the Bipartite Settlement, the Awards or any judicial decision to sanction such a course. In the present reference the concerned workman, or for that matter, the Union, is in effect asking for special leave, that is to say, leave which is to be treated as duty leave with full pay, such leave not to be adjusted against leave to which the concerned workman is entitled under the relevant leave rules. No such right or entitlement has been established.

12. I, therefore, answer the question raised in the Schedule to the Order of reference in the affirmative. The management in relation to the Allahabad Bank, Regional Office, Calcutta are justified in treating Shri Hari Nath Kapoor, General Secretary of Allahabad Bank Cash Staff Association as on casual leave on 18th, 19th May, 28th June 1976 and thereafter also while attending conciliation/adjudication before the authorities. The workman concerned is not entitled to any relief.

Sd/-

S. K. MUKHERJEA, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-12011/23/77-III(A)]

G. S. SUBRAMANIAN, Under Secy.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 10th October, 1979.

New Delhi, the 21st November, 1979

S.O. 3942.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Madras in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of United Commercial Bank, Madras and their workmen over not allowing to Shri P. Haridass, Machine Operator to resume duty with effect from 21-6-76 which was received by the Central Government on the 12-11-79.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, MADRAS
(Constituted by the Government of India)

Industrial Dispute No. 4 of 1979

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947 between the workmen and the Management of United Commercial Bank, Madras].

BETWEEN

Thiru P. Haradass C/o State Labour Union, Room No. 8,
220/221, Walltax Road, Madras-600003.

AND

The Manager, United Commercial Bank,
Assistant General Manager's Office, 13/16, Thambu Chetty
Street, Madras-600001.

REFERENCE :

Order No. L-12012/78/78-D.II A dated 23-1-1979 Ministry of Labour, Government of India.

This dispute coming on this day for hearing upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statements and all other material papers on record and upon hearing of Thiru S. Periyaswamy, Advocate for the workman and of Thiruvalargal V. Sridevan, G. Masilamani and G. Narasimhulu Advocates for the Management and the parties having filed memorandums of settlement and recording the same, this Tribunal made the following.

AWARD

The Central Government in their Order No. L. 12012/78/78-DII A dated 23-1-1979 referred a dispute between the employers in relation to the United Commercial Bank, Madras and their workman Thiru P. Haridass.

The point of reference is as follows :

"Whether the action of the management of United Commercial Bank, Madras in not allowing Shri P. Haridass, Machine Operator to resume his duties with effect from 21-6-76, stating that the workman had voluntarily vacated his employment from 16-6-76 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

The parties were served with summons.

The workman filed a claim statement on 7-3-79 praying for reinstatement with back wages, continuity of service and other benefits due to him.

In repudiation thereof, the Management filed counter statement on 18-4-1979.

After several adjournments, when the dispute was taken up to-day, both sides filed a joint memorandum of settlement.

I went through the settlement and I find that the settlement is fair and equitable and hence it is recorded.

An award is passed in terms of the settlement, which will form part of the award.

No costs.

Dated at Madras, this 26th day of October, 1979.

Sd/-, T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-12012/78/78-D.II(A)]

853 GI/79-2.

MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT BETWEEN THE MANAGEMENT OF UNITED COMMERCIAL BANK, MADRAS AND SHRI P. HARIDASS

Short Recital

By an order dated 17-6-76 made by the Bank, Shri P. Haridass was treated by the Bank as having voluntarily vacated his post with effect from 16-6-1976 and the consequent Industrial Dispute was referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Madras, and the same has been registered as Industrial Dispute No. 4 of 1979 and is pending before the said Industrial Tribunal. The parties have arrived at a settlement on the terms stated below :—

Terms of Settlement

1. The parties agree that on the terms of settlement herein contained being filed before the Industrial Tribunal, Madras, Shri P. Haridass (hereinafter referred to as "the workman") will be taken back in the employment of the Bank on the basic salary and the special allowance namely Rs. 270 p.m. and Rs. 43 p.m. respectively last drawn by him as at the date of his ceasing to be in the Bank's employment i.e. 16-6-1976. Dearness and other allowances will be payable to him as per the rules now in force in the Bank and applicable to the Clerical Cadre.

2. If the workman fails to report for duty within a week from the date of disposal of the said reference in terms of the Settlement herein contained, the Bank shall be under no obligation thereafter to re-employ the workman in the Bank and all his claims shall stand forfeited.

3. The workman's service in the Bank prior to 16-6-1976 shall be taken into account for the purpose of seniority, Provident Fund and Gratuity only and for no other purpose whatsoever. The broken period from 16-6-1976 to the date on which the workman reports for duties in the Bank pursuant to this compromise settlement will be treated as extraordinary leave and without pay and will not be taken into account for any purpose whatsoever.

4. The workman undertakes not to absent himself from duties without prior intimation to and sanction of leave from the Bank and assures the management of his full co-operation, loyal and sincere services and undertakes to abide by all the rules, regulations and discipline of the Bank. If the workman persists in such absenteeism, it will stand aggravated by his previous conduct.

The workman further undertakes to clear all his indebtedness in the market within a period of one year from the date thereof and shall not indulge in such borrowings in future.

5. If the workman commits any breach of the undertaking herein given, the Bank shall be at liberty to terminate his services or take such other action against him as it may deem fit.

6. The workman shall not be entitled to nor shall he claim or caused to be claimed any salary, wages, allowances, bonus or any other benefits whatsoever including increments and promotion for the period from 16-6-1976 to the date which he reports for duty in the Bank pursuant to this compromise settlement.

7. The workman agrees that the settlement herein contained is full and final and resolves all disputes relating to the order dated 17-6-1976 passed by the Bank treating the workman as having voluntarily vacated his post in the Bank with effect from 16-6-1976 and/or in any way arising out of it in connection therewith and he confirms that he has and shall have no further or other claim or claims against the Bank in respect thereof.

Dated at Madras this twenty sixth day of October, 1979

Sd/-, Management for United
Commercial Bank
Assistant General Manager
Management.

Sd. Counsel for Management. Sd. Counsel for workman
T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL, Industrial Tribunal

S.O. 3943.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of United Commercial Bank, Ahmedabad and their workmen over termination of services of Shri S. M. Acharya, Asstt. Cashier with effect from 14-2-78, which was received by the Central Government on the 8-11-79.

BEFORE SHRI R. C. ISRANI, PRESIDING OFFICER,
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, AHMEDABAD

Reference (ITC) No. 1 of 1979

Adjudication

BETWEEN

United Commercial Bank, Ahmedabad

AND

The Workmen employed under it

In the matter of terminating the services of Shri S. M. Acharya.

AWARD

This is a reference made by the Government of India to this Tribunal under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, vide the Government of India, Ministry of Labour's Order No. L-12012/94/78-D.II(A), dated the 16th February, 1979, in respect of an industrial dispute, which has arisen between the parties, viz., United Commercial Bank, Ahmedabad, and the Workmen employed under it.

2. The industrial dispute, as it appears from the schedule attached to the original order, under which this reference has been made, relates to the demand, which is as under:—

"Whether the management of United Commercial Bank Bhadra, Ahmedabad is justified in terminating the services of Shri S. M. Acharya, Asstt. Cashier w.e.f. 14th February, 1978? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled to?"

3. After this reference was received in the office of this Tribunal, notices were issued to the union, viz., the United Commercial Bank Employees' Association, Divetia Blocks, Ahmedabad, and in spite of the service of those notices, neither the union representatives, nor any workman, remained present before this Tribunal in connection with this reference. Ultimately, it was decided that since the workman Shri S. M. Acharya, is concerned in this reference, a notice be directly issued to him for appearing before this Tribunal in connection with this reference. Consequently, the notice, dated 13-9-1979, was issued to him and he was directed to appear before this Tribunal on 11-10-1979.

4. When the reference was taken up for consideration on 11-10-1979, it was found that Shri S. M. Acharya was present. He presented the purshis (Ex. 6), through which it was stated that since he had already been reinstated in his original position, the industrial dispute now no more survived and that he was not prepared to proceed with this reference and wanted to withdraw the demand covered by this reference. It is thus clear from the purshis (Ex. 6), that the industrial dispute which was referred for adjudication to this Tribunal, is now no more in existence and, therefore the reference itself has become infructuous.

5. The present reference having become infructuous is hereby directed to be rejected, with no order as to costs.

R. C. ISRANI, Presiding Officer
[No. L-12012/94/78-D.II(A)]

Ahmedabad,
Dated 15th October, 1979

G. S. SUBRAMANIAN, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 19th November, 1979

S.O. 3944.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Muraidih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Nawagarh, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 15th November, 1979.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD,

Reference No. 12 of 1979.

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S.10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Muraidih colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post office Nawagarh, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the employers : None.

On behalf of the workmen : None.

STATE : Bihar INDUSTRY : Coal
Dhanbad, the 30th October, 1979

AWARD

This is a reference under S. 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi vide order No. L-20012/140/77-D.II(A) dated 19th March, 1979 referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication as per schedule below :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Muraidih colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Nawagarh, District Dhanbad in stopping from work Shri Dukhi Jaiswar, Over Burden Remover with effect from 15th September, 1976, is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

After the receipt of the reference written statement was filed by the employers, and no step has yet been taken by the workmen. When the case was fixed for hearing on 7-8-79, the employers filed a letter dated 12-12-78 stating that the concerned workman had expired in the morning of 12-12-78. Thereafter, on the subsequent date of hearing none appeared on behalf of the workman before the court nor took any step in this case. Ultimately, when the case was fixed for hearing on 30-10-79 none of the parties appeared. From this it would thus appear that the parties are not interested in the reference pending before this Tribunal for adjudication. I therefore, submit a 'No dispute' award in this reference.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. I-20012/140/77-D.II(A)]
S. H. S. IYER, Desk Officer.